



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

12

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

BOARD OF EDITORS

GEORGE B. ADAMS

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART

WILLIAM M. SLOANE

HARRY PRATT JUDSON

H. MORSE STEPHENS

MANAGING EDITOR

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

VOL. VI

OCTOBER 1900 TO JULY 1901

53978
7/4/02

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

1901

COPYRIGHT, 1901
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

E
17.1
A57
v.6

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY,
LANCASTER, PA.

CONTENTS OF VOL. VI

NUMBER 1. OCTOBER, 1900.

ARTICLES

ALBERT E. MCKINLEY	The English and Dutch Towns of New Netherland	I
JOHN B. SANBORN	Some Political Aspects of Homestead Legislation	19
WALTER L. FLEMING	The Buford Expedition to Kansas	38
GEORGE L. BURR	The Guiana Boundary	49
DOCUMENTS—Diary of John Harrower, 1773-1776		65
REVIEWS OF BOOKS		108
COMMUNICATIONS		181
NOTES AND NEWS		183

NUMBER 2. JANUARY, 1901.

ARTICLES

CHARLES F. ADAMS	The Sifted Grain and the Grain-Sifters	197
R. M. JOHNSTON	Mirabeau's Secret Mission to Berlin	235
JAMES B. ANGELL	The Turkish Capitulations	254
CARL BECKER	Nominations in Colonial New York	260
EDWARD G. BOURNE	The Legend of Marcus Whitman	276
DOCUMENTS—Diary of Samuel Cooper, 1775, 1776; Letter of John Quincy Adams, 1811		301
REVIEWS OF BOOKS		345
NOTES AND NEWS		394

NUMBER 3. APRIL, 1901.

ARTICLES

	The Meeting of the American Historical Association at Detroit and Ann Arbor . . .	413
GEORGE L. BURR	The Year 1000 and the Antecedents of the Crusades	429
CHARLES GROSS	The Political Influence of the University of Paris in the Middle Ages	440
CHARLES H. LEVERMORE	The Rise of Metropolitan Journalism, 1800-1840	446
JAMES F. RHODES	Sherman's March to the Sea	466
PAUL S. REINICH	French Experience with Representative Government in the West Indies	475
DOCUMENTS—The Society of Dissenters founded at New York in 1769; Miranda and the British Admiralty, 1804-1806		498
REVIEWS OF BOOKS		531
NOTES AND NEWS		615

NUMBER 4. JULY, 1901.

ARTICLES

WILLIAM MILLER	The Republic of San Marino	633
NORMAN M. TRENHOLME	The Risings in the English Monastic Towns in 1327	650
H. P. BIGGAR	The French Hakluyt; Marc Lescarbot of Verbins	671
ALBERT E. MCKINLEY	The Transition from Dutch to English Rule in New York	693
DOCUMENTS—Letters of Dr. Thomas Cooper, 1825-1832; Letters on the Nullification Movement in South Carolina, 1830-1834, I.; A Ministerial Crisis in France, 1876		725
REVIEWS OF BOOKS		770
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL—A Trial Bibliography of American Diplomacy, by Albert Bushnell Hart		848
NOTES AND NEWS		867
INDEX		885

The
American Historical Review

THE ENGLISH AND DUTCH TOWNS OF NEW
NETHERLAND

IN the small trading stations which the Dutch established at Fort Orange and on Manhattan Island it would be useless to look for political conditions. The houses were purely commercial stations occupied during the summer's trading season and deserted in the winter. It was only by an accident to their vessel that a few sailors were compelled to stay on Manhattan Island during the winter of 1613-1614, but from that time the country was never entirely deserted. The company of traders who received a charter under the name of the New Netherland Company obtained exclusive commercial privileges, but no governmental powers. Quite different, however, was the charter of 1621 to the West India Company. This elaborate patent granted political as well as commercial privileges, and had in view the permanent settlement of the country.

The charter gave to the Company the exclusive right to trade upon the west coast of Africa, the entire coast of America from the Straits of Magellan to the extreme north, and all places situated between Africa and America. Within these bounds the Company was to have almost sovereign powers; it could make alliances with princes and natives; it might build forts; it could appoint and discharge civil and military and other public officers "for the preservation of the places, keeping good order, police and justice, and in like manner for the promoting of trade;" and it could "advance the peopling of fruitful and unsettled parts." The stock of the Company was apportioned among the provinces of the Netherlands and its affairs were to be directed by a representative Council of Nineteen. The States General retained some control over the Company and its colonies by commissioning the governors, and approving their instructions, and by requiring reports from time to time.

Naturally the government established by such a trading company was one which served the ends of immediate commercial necessity, while the ultimate benefit to be derived from increased population and permanent settlement was lost from sight. In 1624, Peter Minuit, the first Director under the Company, arrived, and called together his council of five persons, which, with himself, was to have supreme executive, legislative and judicial powers.¹ For several years the Company offered few inducements to emigrants and as a consequence the colony grew slowly in numbers, although its trade prospered. In 1629 a step toward the encouragement of emigration from the Netherlands was taken by the publication of thirty-one articles of "Freedoms and Exemptions granted by the Assembly of the XIX. of the Privileged West India Company, to all such as shall plant any colonies in New Netherland."²

The familiar provisions of these "patroon" concessions need no analysis here, but reference may be made to some of the minor articles concerning individual colonies, which interest us, in the study of the origins of popular government, much more deeply than the elaborate feudal provisions of the patroon system. The articles, in addition to granting to patroons extensive commercial and political privileges, also provided that individual settlers might take up as much land as "they shall be able properly to improve," giving them also the right of fishing and hunting near their settlements, and promising them the protection of the Company against internal and external disturbances. Further, the colonies lying along each river, or on each island, were to appoint deputies to give information of the condition of their colonies to the Commander and Council. These reports were to be made annually and the deputies were to be newly appointed every two years.³ Thus imbedded in the mass of feudalism of the patroon concessions were two elements which in course of time might have overthrown both the patroon system and the arbitrary government of the Company—the encouragement of the small independent landowners, and the development of representative government. But neither of these results followed immediately. A few of the directors of the West India Company hoped to use the patroon concessions in building up their private fortunes, and establishing for themselves princely estates upon the Company's lands. Thus for a time little encouragement was given to individual settlers.

For nine years the Company continued its narrow policy, and the growth of the colony was retarded by the feudal patroon govern-

¹ O'Callaghan, *History of New Netherland*, I. 100.

² O'Callaghan, I. 112-120.

³ Article XXVIII.

ments and by the Company's trade monopoly.¹ Information of the feeble state of the settlement was brought to the States General, who, on April 26, 1638, directed the Assembly of the XIX. of the West India Company to take effectual steps in the settlement of their colony by inviting all good inhabitants of the Netherlands by suitable inducements to populate those parts.² This action upon the part of the States General had a most beneficial effect upon the future policy of the Company and the welfare of their colony. In the following September trade with the colony was thrown open to all inhabitants of the Netherlands and their allies. Each settler was promised as much land as he and his family could cultivate,³ while the new freedom of trade made it possible for him to stock his farm and secure supplies from Europe. In these orders, however, there was no provision for local popular government, for all political power, except upon the patroon estates, still remained in the hands of the Company's officials.

The first step toward local self-government came shortly after the orders of 1638. In 1640 the patroon concessions of 1629 were materially modified by a curtailment of the powers and territory of the patroons, by the addition of inducements to smaller colonists, and by the promise of local political privileges.⁴ The provisions respecting town government were based upon the customs of Holland, where the form prevailed of nominating a double or triple number of candidates for the village offices, from which the local lord or authority selected a single number to fill the positions. The new provision reads :

"And should it happen that the dwelling-places of private colonists become so numerous as to be accounted towns, villages or cities, the Company shall give orders respecting the subaltern government, magistrates, and ministers of justice, who shall be nominated by the said towns and villages in a triple number of the best qualified, from which a choice and selection is to be made by the Governor and Council ; and those shall determine all questions and suits within their district."

This order was subsequently modified so that

"the qualified persons of such cities, villages, and hamlets shall, in such case, be authorized to nominate for the office of magistrates a double number of persons, wherefrom a selection shall seasonably be made by the Director and Council. . . . And justice shall be administered therein according to the style and order of the province of Holland, and the

¹ O'Callaghan, I. 200.

² *Documents relating to the Colonial History of New York*, I. 106. Quoted hereafter as *N. Y. Col. Doc.*

³ O'Callaghan, I. 203.

⁴ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, I. 119-123.

cities and manors thereof, to which end the courts there shall follow, as far as the same is possible, the ordinances received here in Amsterdam." ¹

The order of 1640 marks a decided change in the policy of the Company. For the future, instead of encouraging the establishment of patroon estates, the officers of the Company were directed to further the growth of towns and villages composed of independent settlers. The old concentration of all governmental authority in the Director and Council at New Amsterdam was abolished, and in its place was put the Dutch system of local government. Almost at the same time, owing to difficulties with the Indians, the Director was compelled to have recourse to a representative political system. Thus from this time, the political history of New Netherland shows two tendencies, one leading to the extension of local governmental privileges and the other to a system whereby the localities might be represented in the central conduct of affairs. For the present it is our purpose to trace the course of the first tendency, leading to the development of town institutions.

Within the jurisdiction of the New Amsterdam authorities there arose two forms of town government. One was based upon the customs of the Netherlands and developed in the towns settled by the Dutch, while the other was brought into the Dutch territory from New England by English settlers. In one the aristocratic institutions, the local customs and the political lethargy of Holland were reproduced. In the other the democratic spirit of the New England town was dominant. The reason for this division of local government into two forms will become more apparent as we glance at the political practice of the Dutch and the English towns under the New Netherland jurisdiction.

Considering first the Dutch towns, it is interesting to notice the manner of their settlement. Almost all the early land-grants of the West India Company were made to single individuals.² There was little preconcerted immigration to the colony by organized bodies of settlers, except to the patroon estates. The settlers rarely had agreements and understandings with one another before settling, and it is doubtful if any community, either of political power or of lands, existed until about 1645.³ Accident, or ties of blood or race,⁴ or the situation of desirable land, or the friendship of individuals were usually the causes which led to the concentration of population in any locality. Throughout all the early period there

¹ O'Callaghan, I. 392-393.

² See *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. and XIV., *passim*.

³ The first grant of political privileges to a Dutch town was made to Breuckelen (Brooklyn), in June, 1646. See Stiles, *History of Brooklyn*, I. 45-46.

⁴ The Walloons on the present site of Brooklyn, 1623.

was no conscious settlement of communities by the Dutch agricultural colonists.¹

The individualism of the Dutch was in strong contrast to the social spirit shown in the English towns. Under the new privileges of 1640 each man could take as much land as he could cultivate, and naturally the result was the separation of farms and homesteads from one another. This made the defence of the scattered plantations so difficult that action was called forth from the home authorities, who saw the advantages of the close settlement of the English towns. In the instructions of July 7, 1645, sent to the Director and Council at New Amsterdam,² occurs the significant clause :

“They shall endeavor as much as possible, that the colonists settle themselves with a certain number of families in some of the most suitable places, in the manner of villages, towns and hamlets, *as the English are in the habit of doing, who thereby live more securely.*”

But the policy was a difficult one to impose upon the colonists. They had no common interest in the land, no local political powers, and although most of the settlers professed a common religious belief, they had but scant opportunity, perhaps little desire, for common religious worship.³ Thus the early Dutch settlements lacked three controlling forces which among the English contributed to the development of the towns.

What the colonists would not voluntarily agree to, the Director and Company tried to accomplish by rules and ordinances. Orders were passed in 1656 and 1660⁴ providing that the inhabitants of each locality should build forts and towns. At Cummunipaw, the settlers who had been driven out by the Indians in 1655 were required by Stuyvesant in 1658 to build their houses in one village.⁵ On the Esopus, the settlers showed such reluctance to dwelling in a village, that Stuyvesant was compelled to visit Wiltwyck in person, and there superintend the building of a fort and the apportionment of town lots.⁶ In the same year a patent was issued to all who should settle in a new village on Manhattan Island, granting certain lands to each settler, and a local court when the village had obtained a population of twenty or twenty-five families.⁷ More than two years passed, however, before a

¹ Thomson's *Long Island* (second ed.) I. 107 ; Wood, *Long Island*, 81.

² *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, I. 160-162.

³ Brodhead, *History of the State of New York*, I. 614.

⁴ *Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland*, 206, 234, 368.

⁵ Brodhead, I. 642.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I. 648.

⁷ *Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland*, 335.

population was obtained large enough to entitle them to the political provisions of the patent.¹ It will thus be seen that the town was by no means a spontaneous natural growth among the Dutch. Often it required all the force of Stuyvesant's arbitrary government to compel the colonists to concentrate their settlements. And when the concentration was accomplished, the town does not appear to have developed the autonomous democratic government which arose in the English towns.

By granting lands in severalty, town development was seriously retarded, just as in New England the granting of lands in common encouraged that development. In New Netherland, contrary to the usual New England method, many years often elapsed after the original settlement of a locality, before it obtained political privileges. With the exception of New Haarlem mentioned above, none of the Dutch towns received corporate political rights until a considerable period after settlement.²

Having seen that town life developed late and with difficulty among the Dutch, we must now look at the institutions which were finally established in the towns of New Netherland. Following the directions of the Exemptions of 1640, when political privileges were granted to towns, they were based upon the customs of Holland. The first charter granted to a Dutch town, was that to Brooklyn in 1646.³ From the preliminary recital given therein, it appears that the settlers of Brooklyn had met on May 21, 1646, in accordance with the Exemptions, and had unanimously elected two persons to act as schepens. The election was followed by a unanimous written agreement that if any one should refuse to submit to the lawful authority of the two schepens, he should forfeit the rights he claimed to land in the allotment of the town. In June the Director and Council confirmed this election, and gave the schepens power to select two more persons from the inhabitants to act as additional schepens, if the work of the original officers should be too heavy. In the fall of the same year, the schepens complained to the Director of the onerous nature of their duties, and suggested the name of a person to act as schout. On December 1, the Director and Council gave to Brooklyn a separate schout, and confirmed the nominee of the schepens to that office. These details

¹ O'Callaghan, II. 428.

² Bergen settled, 1617; incorporated, 1661. Brooklyn settled, 1623; incorporated, 1646. Flatbush settled, 1623; incorporated, 1654. Beverwyck settled, 1634; incorporated, partially, 1652. Amersfoort settled, 1645 (?); incorporated, 1654. New Utrecht settled, 1657; incorporated, 1661. Wiltwyck settled, 1656; incorporated, 1661. Haarlem settled and incorporated, 1658. Bushwyck settled, 1660; incorporated, 1661.

³ Stiles, *History of the City of Brooklyn*, I. 45-46.

are given because they illustrate the manner of election of the local officials ; the first two schepens were elected by those having a share in the lands of the town ; the schout, on the other hand, was selected by the schepens and confirmed by the Director and Council. Popular election was permitted only in the first choice of officials ; thereafter the officers named their successors. We will note this system in detail.

The schout and schepens mentioned in this first charter to a Dutch town are the officers of the local court. The schout corresponded in the main to the modern prosecuting attorney,¹ although at times his duties partook of the nature of those of the sheriff, and at other times he presided over the court.² The schepens, whose title is sometimes translated magistrate, exercised both judicial and administrative functions. In the town of Wiltwyck they were to hold fortnightly courts, except during harvest-time, at which they were empowered to try without appeal civil cases where the value in controversy was below fifty guilders. They had jurisdiction of petty criminal offences, *i. e.*, those in which there was no letting of blood, and in matters of greater moment they could apprehend criminals. But in addition to these judicial powers, the schepens had authority similar to those of the New England selectmen or the town-meeting. They could advise the Director and Council to pass orders concerning roads, the enclosure of lands, and the regulation of churches and schools,³ and in certain cases could make and enforce orders without waiting for the consent of the Director.⁴ But no provision was made in the charters granted to the Dutch towns for the direct action of the people in town affairs. There was no recognition of the town-meeting as a local political organization, but all ordinances, even of a local nature, must receive the approval of the Director and Council after they had been passed by the local court.⁵

¹ Brodhead, I. 453-454.

² *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 196 ; Instructions for Schout of New Amsterdam, April 9, 1660, *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 463.

³ Charter of Wiltwyck, *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 196-198.

⁴ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 369, 370.

⁵ The records are not wholly void of evidence of legislative or administrative activity exercised directly by the people in the Dutch towns before the English conquest. But in the few cases recorded, it appears to have been on extraordinary occasions, and not as an integral part of the local government.

In school and church matters there is some slight evidence of local action. See for Bergen, *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 232 and 319. In Brooklyn, on August 30, 1660, the magistrates, "pursuant to an order from the Hon^{ble} Director-General", "convened all the inhabitants of the village of Breuckelen, talked to them and investigated, how much they could together contribute to the salary of Dr Selyns" (*N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 479). This sounds little like the independent action of the English town-meetings only a few miles distant from Brooklyn on the Long Island shores.

We are more intimately concerned with the election of officers than with their powers. The charter of Brooklyn¹ of 1646 shows that the earliest magistrates of that village were elected by those interested in the lands of the town. The same method of electing the first magistrates was adopted in New Haarlem in 1658,² and in Bushwick in 1661.³ In the latter case the inhabitants asked Stuyvesant for lands and political privileges, and were directed to select six persons from whom the Director might select three as magistrates. In other cases, however, the first schepens seem not to have been elected by the people, but to have been named in the charter itself. This was true of the charters of Wiltwyck,⁴ Bergen,⁵ and Staten Island.⁶

The popular suffrage thus sometimes allowed to the Dutch settlers in the choice of their first magistrates under the town charters, was not continued in subsequent elections. In all cases which I have been able to find, a two-fold restriction was placed upon the towns. First, the magistrates, when changed, were to be elected by the Director and Council at New Amsterdam from a double number of candidates presented to them; and secondly, this nomination was made not by the townspeople, but by the magistrates already in office. A few citations from the many instances in the records will illustrate these restrictions.

In April, 1655, the magistrates of Brooklyn petitioned the Director and Council to be permitted to send in a double number of candidates for new magistrates. The Council in reply directed the magistrates to inform them, "as far as it is in their power, of the character, manners, and expertness of the most respectable individuals of their village and places in its vicinity under their jurisdiction." The magistrates accordingly sent in nominations, from which the Director and Council selected three to act as schepens for the future.⁷ In all this transaction there is no mention made of popular election; the magistrates now, instead of the people, make the nominations to the Director and his Council. The Wiltwyck charter contained the provision:

"Whereas it is customary in our Fatherland and other well-regulated governments, that annually some change take place in the magistracy, so that some new ones are appointed, and some are continued to inform the

¹ Stiles, *History of Brooklyn*, I. 45.

² *Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland*, 335; O'Callaghan, II. 428.

³ Thompson, *History of Long Island*, second ed., II. 155.

⁴ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 196-198.

⁵ *Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland*, 403.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 458.

⁷ Stiles, *Hist. of Brooklyn*, I. 111.

newly appointed, so shall the Schepens, now confirmed, pay due attention to the conversation, conduct, and abilities of honest and decent persons, inhabitants of their respective village, to inform the Director-General and Council, about the time of the next election, as to who might be sufficiently qualified to be then elected by the Director-General and Council."¹

Again there is no mention of popular election; the magistrates nominate, the Director and Council elect. Similar provisions were inserted in the charters of New Haarlem, Bergen and New Utrecht. Still more limited were the local political powers granted by Governor Colve after the Dutch re-conquest in 1673. The Governor issued an order for the reorganization of the government of the towns of Midwout, Amersfoort, Breuckelen, New Utrecht and Gravesend, in which he reinstated the old form of nomination and confirmation of magistrates:

"Previous to the annual election, the Sheriff and Schepens shall make [a list], in nomination for Schepens, of a double number of the best qualified, honest, intelligent, and wealthiest inhabitants (but only those belonging to, or well affected toward, the Reformed Christian Religion), and shall present it [to] the Governor, who shall then make a selection, and, if he deem it best, confirm some of the old Schepens."²

In accordance with the provisions of these charters, the magistrates of the Dutch towns were accustomed to send their nominations to the Director. No reference is made in their letters or in the action of the Director and Council to any elections by the townsmen. The nominations are said to be "made and presented," or "made and submitted" by the schepens, by the commissaries, by the magistrates, by the schout and schepens.³ These words are quite significant when compared with the letters from the English towns making their double nominations, in which there is usually internal evidence of the suffrage in town-meetings.⁴ The Dutch letters give no hint of such popular action, and in place of town elections, the close-corporation system of the Holland towns prevailed.

The conclusion we must come to from all the evidence obtainable is that there were no regular town-meetings among the Dutch, no popular elections for magistrates, and that the magistracy was of the nature of a close corporation, some retiring annually,⁵ and their

¹ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 196.

² Stiles, *History of Brooklyn*, I. 162.

³ See *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. and XIV., *passim*; e. g., XIII. 231, 336; XIV. 257, 344, 414, 510, 520, 522, 523.

⁴ See *post*, p. 12.

⁵ I have been unable to find the principle underlying this practice of partial retirement. See *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 314, 344, 412, 473, etc. For instance of removal for cause, see *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 336.

places being filled by a selection made by the Director and Council from a double nomination by the acting magistrates.

Turning from the Dutch towns, let us look at the government of the English settlements which grew up under the New Amsterdam jurisdiction, and in which an entirely different political atmosphere existed. The earliest mention of settlement by the English within the Dutch territory is in 1640, when eight Englishmen settled near the present site of Hempstead, having bought title to the land from Farret, the American representative of Lord Stirling.¹ The English intruders were arrested by the Dutch and imprisoned in New Amsterdam; but they were subsequently released upon their promise to leave the jurisdiction.² The next year, 1641, in response to an inquiry from some Englishmen as to terms of settlement, the reply was made that they would be allowed to select four or five of their ablest men, from whom the governor of the Dutch would select a single magistrate.³ This exaggerated form of the multiple nominating system would have given the English less liberal government than that later granted to the Dutch towns; but the terms were not accepted.

Soon, however, a marked immigration set into the Dutch territories from New England. In 1642 and the years immediately following, a number of English settlers reached western Long Island.⁴ They were well received by Director Kieft, who gave them tracts of land, and authorized the establishment of town governments. Before Brooklyn received its separate local court in 1646, Kieft had granted charters of incorporation to four English towns: Mespeth (Newtown),⁵ Hempstead,⁶ Vlissingen (Flushing)⁷ and Gravesend.⁸ These charters, granted almost immediately after the settlements were made, defined the territory of the patentees and provided for their political organization. All four antedated the earliest Dutch town charter, and this fact is strong evidence that the communal spirit was more intense among the English than among the Dutch. Ten or twenty years might elapse in the life of the Dutch settlements before they received incorporation or any local govern-

¹ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, II, 145-150; Flint, *Early Long Island*, 120. Lord Stirling had received from the Plymouth Company a patent for Long Island, and his agent, Farret, sold patents for land on the island to New Englanders. Stirling's patent is printed in *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV, 29, note.

² Subsequently they settled Southampton in eastern Long Island.

³ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII, 8.

⁴ In *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, I, 181, is a Dutch statement of the causes of this English immigration.

⁵ March 28, 1642.

⁶ November 16, 1644.

⁷ October 10, 1645.

⁸ December 19, 1645.

ment whatever. With the English the corporate town life began before or immediately after settlement. In the same way the communal ownership of lands and common interest in religious worship date, in the English towns, from the time of settlement, while in the Dutch towns they developed long after the original settlement.

Further, the charters of the English towns differed from the ordinances which established local government in the Dutch settlements in several important particulars. The English charters were granted to companies of individuals who had usually formed an agreement before their settlement, while the Dutch settlers were often forced into an agreement, and compelled to take up lands in common,¹ at the dictation of the Director and against their own will. The English charters gave the settlers power to form "a bodye politique and ciuill combination,"² to which they, and their associates, heirs and successors were to belong. In the case of Gravesend, the power was also given "to make such ciuill ordinances as the Maior part of the Inhabitants free of the Towne shall thinke fitting for theyr quiett and peaceable subsisting," thus recognizing the town-meeting as an integral part of the local government.

The local officials provided for by these charters were called by varying names—magistrates, "some of theirs," schepens—but their duties corresponded to the judicial duties of the officers of the Dutch local court. All the charters required the officers to be named to the Director and Council for confirmation. No direct mention is made of a double nominating system, such as was given to the Dutch towns, but by subsequent practice three of the towns always presented double nominations to the Director and Council; while Gravesend alone was permitted the privilege of presenting a single number of candidates.³ We have seen that the candidates in the Dutch towns were selected by the outgoing magistrates. In the English charters, the patentees, their associates and successors are given that power; thus vesting the election of officers in the people.⁴

In addition to the features in which the English town charters differed from the Dutch, there were of course points of similarity.

¹ This was true at Cummunipaw, at Wiltwyck on the upper Hudson, and was attempted without success among the conquered Swedes on the Schuylkill at Passayung.

² Gravesend charter in *Documentary History of New York*, I. 629-632. Similar provision in Hempstead charter; Thompson, *History of Long Island*, second ed., II. 4-6.

³ This extraordinary feature was carried out in practice; see *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV 130, 329, 343, 422, etc.

⁴ True of the first charter granted to an English town, Mespath, in 1642 (four years before a Dutch town received local government). *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 38. See the other charters as well.

Both were granted freedom to practise the Reformed Christian religion; the same system of appeals to the Director and Council was provided for; towns must be built; fortifications erected; allegiance must be given to the West India Company and the States General; and after a period of years, taxes were to be paid to the Company.¹

In the practice of government under the charters of the English towns, we find a much closer similarity to the local institutions of New England than to those of New Netherland. The affairs of the town were determined in town-meeting. There the people made local rules, granted lands, determined the suffrage, and elected their candidates to office. The letters presenting to the Director and Council the new nominations are not signed by the outgoing schout and schepens, but by the clerks of the towns.² They usually state that the nomination is "made and submitted," "by the inhabitants of said village," "by the whole community," "by the inhabitants by a plurality of votes," or similar expressions implying popular election.³ Thus here the whole community acted in the choice of its magistrates; there was no close corporation modelled after the seventeenth-century town-corporations of Holland.

A perusal of the records leads one to the inevitable conclusion that all this democratic political development was peculiarly English. Kieft, indeed, granted these charters, but their terms are so evidently English that we cannot doubt they were dictated by the incoming New Englanders.⁴ As the Holland town customs were reproduced in the Dutch towns, so the New England town furnished the model for government in the English towns under Dutch influence. The spirit of popular government came from the English and not from the Dutch settlers.

One of the necessary concomitants of popular government is the suffrage question. For no sooner are elections vested in the people, than the question arises as to the meaning of the word people. In these English towns the New England customs were closely followed in this respect. By the charters, the privilege of the suffrage was conferred upon the original patentees and their associates, and

¹ In 1656 two other groups of English settlers were given town privileges similar, not to the English, but to the Dutch towns; Vreedland (Westchester), *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 65-66; and Rustdorp (Jamaica), *Col. Doc.*, XIV. 339-340.

² *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 329, 343, 346, 425, etc.

³ See *New York Col. Doc.*, XIV., *passim*; e. g., 189, 296, 300, 329, 343, 345, 422, 424.

⁴ The Gravesend charter has been called a "veritable Dutch charter of civil and religious freedom" (Elting, *Dutch Village Communities on the Hudson River*, Johns Hopkins University Studies, IV. 26). It is Dutch in little else than the fact that a Dutch governor granted it.

thus by implication, if not by express grant, the original settlers were given power to add to their numbers. These associates, upon receiving their lots and the rights in the common lands, obtained at the same time a voice in the town-meeting.¹ The same privilege might be gained by those who purchased land from the original owners, and to prevent by this means the influx of undesirable inhabitants, it was customary to place restrictions upon the sale of land.² In Hempstead, "quakers and such like" were excluded; and letters of commendation and approbation must be brought by persons coming from other towns.³ Once possessed of land within the town, the owner had an indisputable right to a voice in the town affairs.⁴ In all these respects the customs of the New England colonies were closely followed.

It has been mentioned that all four of the early charters to English towns were granted by Kieft. His successor, Stuyvesant, showed no such favorable disposition, but evinced an unremitting opposition to popular government, both in the towns and in representative provincial institutions. His opinions on the subject are preserved in his correspondence concerning the assembly of 1653. Under the influence of the English delegates,⁵ the representatives who met at New Amsterdam in 1653 drew up a remonstrance on December 11, in which, among other charges against the government, they say that "Officers and Magistrates, though by their personal qualifications deserving such honors, are appointed, contrary to the laws of Netherland, to divers offices without the consent or nomination of the people whom the matter most affects or concerns."⁶ To this demand for popular elections, Stuyvesant answered by admitting the right of the English to nominate their own magistrates, but stated also that some of them even usurped "the election and appointment of such Magistrates, as they please, without regard to their religion. Some, especially the people of Gravesend, elect libertines and Anabaptists, which is decidedly against the laws of the Netherlands."⁷ The Director further questioned the advisability of popular elections, for "if it is to be made a rule, that the selection and nomination shall be left to the people generally, whom it most concerns, then every one would want for Magistrate

¹ In Hempstead, *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 529.

² In Gravesend, owners of land desiring to sell must first offer the land to the town; and after the town's refusal to purchase, they could sell to an outsider if he were not an infamous person or a disturber of the common peace. *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 128-129.

³ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 529.

⁴ See the demands of some Dutch landholders in Gravesend, *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 329.

⁵ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, I. 553.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I. 552.

⁷ *Ibid.*, XIV. 235.

a man of his own stamp, for instance a thief would choose for Magistrate a thief, and a dishonest man, a drunkard, a smuggler, etc., their likes, in order to commit felonies and frauds with so much more freedom."¹ Early in the next year the Director and Council, following out their policy of opposition to popular government, required the magistrates and inhabitants of Gravesend to prove by their charter their right to nominate and elect magistrates and to continue them in office.²

The evils of popular government as he saw them must have influenced Stuyvesant in his grants to the two new English towns patented in 1656. Thomas Wheeler and the other English settlers at Westchester (Vreedland) had informed the New Amsterdam authorities that they would submit to the Dutch jurisdiction if they could have the privilege of choosing their officers, of making laws for the good of the township, of distributing lands, and of making choice of new inhabitants. To these demands they received the reply that they might have the "conditions and patents" of the Dutch villages of Middelburg, Amersfoort, Midwout and Breuckelen, and also the right of nominating a double number of candidates for office.³ The English remained, however, and seem to have interpreted their rights under this grant to suit themselves.⁴ In the same year Rustdorp (Jamaica) on Long Island was incorporated "under the same privileges and exemptions and special grants, as the inhabitants of New Netherlands generally enjoy, as well in the possession of their lands, as in the election of their Magistrates on the footing and order in use in the villages of Middelburg, Breuckelen, Midwout and Amersfoort."⁵ In this case, also, the English held their town-meetings, and we have left to us some very interesting town orders concerning the allotment of the town lands and the reaping of the common meadow.⁶ Both charters of Stuyvesant show his determination to give no more special privileges to the English settlers.⁷

¹ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 235.

² *Ibid.*, 253. In 1655 objections were made to a town election of Gravesend by some Dutch landholders in the town because votes were cast in the names of persons in prison for crimes, of persons who had left the town, and those who had conspired against the government of the country. *Ibid.*, XIV. 330.

³ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 65-66.

⁴ Bolton, *History of Westchester County*, revised ed., II. 279-281.

⁵ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 339-340.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 504-506.

⁷ In Flushing, owing to the large number of Quakers who had settled there, Stuyvesant found a good opportunity to repress popular government. Town-meetings were forbidden, and their place was to be taken by seven tribunes elected once and for all, who were to act as counsellors of the schout and magistrates. *Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland*, 338.

One other illustration of Stuyvesant's policy in local government is to be found in his negotiations with a party of Milford Englishmen, who proposed leaving their homes rather than agree to the union of Connecticut and New Haven. The intending settlers asked permission to control their own civil affairs, elect their magistrates, and make such laws as seemed to them suitable. Stuyvesant at first replied that they might have privileges equal to those of the Dutch towns; the double nomination of magistrates, and the passage of laws by the magistrates with the consent of the Director and Council; but he refused the power to choose their own inhabitants. The answer was not satisfactory to the New Englanders, for it did not state the manner of election of the magistrates, did not grant legislative powers to the town-meeting, and refused the privilege of admitting their own inhabitants. But the West India Company was at this time favoring the immigration of English dissenters, and accordingly, in May, 1662, Stuyvesant modified his former proposition, and granted practically all the demands of the English.¹

Stuyvesant's whole policy appears essentially different from that of Kieft. The latter encouraged English immigration and allowed the settlers to choose their own form of local self-government, although at the same time he was governing all the Dutch settlements on the Delaware, on the Hudson, and on Long Island arbitrarily, and without a hint of any popular control in local affairs. Stuyvesant, on the other hand, incorporated many of the Dutch villages, but according to the Dutch, and not the English model. A close corporation was established in each of the Dutch towns, which reproduced in miniature the aristocratic organization of the Netherland towns of that day. There was naturally an inconsistency in allowing the English strangers greater liberty than the native Dutch citizens, and this may account in part for Stuyvesant's opposi-

¹Stuyvesant's second letter is a curious document: "The Governour and Counsel doe give Consent that the aforesaid *English* Nation beinge setlet vnder this government shal have power by the most vote of the Churches members, to nominate their owne Magistrates, in such a quantity as they shall thinck most meete and needfull for their towne or Townes, which Magistrates with the freemen shal be Impoured, to make such Lawes and Ordinances, as occasion shal require, which lawes and ordinances after Examination beinge found not oppugnant to the general Lawes of the Vnited *Belgick* and this Province shal by the Governour and Counsel be Ratified and Confirmed vnto them, only the Governour and Counsel doe Reserve the Appeale of Criminel and Civil Sentences above the Sum of fifty pound Sterlinge, without Reformation or appeale to that Sum, for all such Inhabitans as therevnto shal Subschrybe and the Confirmation of the Magistrates out of dubbel Number yearly to be presented vnto them, out of which dubbel Number with advyce or Communication of the old Magistrates or their deputies the following Magistrates by the Governour and Counsel then beinge shal be Confirmed." *Col. Doc.*, XIII. 222. The projected removal did not take place until after the English occupation.

tion to the English towns.¹ But there must have been other reasons as well. Stuyvesant's own words criticizing popular government have already been given; and we must also remember that the English were beginning to demand a total separation from the Dutch, and a combination with the English of Connecticut and New Haven.

We have thus far traced the features of local government in the two classes of towns under the Dutch government, but in closing, mention must be made of the local government of New Amsterdam itself. From the first settlement of Manhattan Island down to the year 1649 the records show no demand upon the part of the inhabitants of New Amsterdam for local governmental powers distinct from those of the Company's officials. In 1649 the representative body of the Nine Men sent a letter to the States General depicting the "very poor and most low condition" of the province, and asking for a redress of their grievances. Among the reforms which they thought would encourage population and promote prosperity was the establishment of a "suitable municipal government."² A commission of three men was appointed to take this petition and a lengthy remonstrance against the government of Kieft and Stuyvesant to Holland.³ After an elaborate investigation by the States General, a committee of that body reported a "Provisional Order respecting the Government, Preservation and Peopling of New Netherland."⁴ Among the reforms there proposed, we find the first mention of municipal government for New Amsterdam: "XVII. And within the city of New Amsterdam shall be erected a Burgher Government, consisting of a Sheriff, two Burgomasters, and 5 Schepens." This report was not adopted, but the fear of its passage forced the West India Company to make concessions to the inhabitants of New Amsterdam, and on April 4, 1652, Stuyvesant was directed to "erect there a Court of Justice formed, as much as possible, after the custom of this city" [Amsterdam]. The court was to have the officers named in the former provisional order, who were to be chosen from the "honest and respectable" persons of the settlement, the Directors expressing the hope that some of such persons could be found among the burghers.⁵

Ten months passed after the dating of this instruction to Stuyvesant before the latter inaugurated the new city government.

¹ In one of his letters, Stuyvesant says: "It ought to be remembered that the Englishmen . . . enjoy more privileges than the Exemptions of New Netherland grant to any Hollander." *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 233.

² *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, I. 260.

³ Brodhead, I. 506-507.

⁴ *Doc. Hist. of N. Y.*, I. 598; *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, I. 387-391.

⁵ *Doc. Hist. of N. Y.*, I. 599-600.

When he was ready to take that step, he allowed no popular election of the officials, but appointed the two burgomasters and five schepens and directed that the Company's sheriff should act as schout for the city.¹ In 1654² and 1656³ the burgomasters and schepens of New Amsterdam petitioned for the privilege of nominating a double number of candidates as their successors. In January of the latter year, Stuyvesant agreed to such a double nomination upon the condition that⁴ the acting magistrates should always be considered as in nomination; that the nominees should be well qualified persons, favorable to the Director and Council; and that a member of the Council should be present at the meeting when the burgomasters and schepens made the nominations.⁴ Under this arrangement the local officials were annually elected until the coming of the English.

Here again the influence of the Holland customs is seen. In the Middle Ages the towns and cities of the Low Countries had acquired democratic governments, but by the seventeenth century these had been gradually undermined by aristocratic classes. Popular elections had given way to close corporations and systems of double or triple nomination.⁵ And these were the institutions which were now established in New Amsterdam. There was no popular election, but the outgoing magistrates nominated a double number for their successors; and even this nomination was not free, for a member of the Director's council must be present at the election.

Shortly after this, the Director introduced another of the features of Dutch conservatism, in the establishment of a greater and a lesser "burgerregt." The greater burgerregt was held by those who had held, or whose ancestors had held high civil, military or ecclesiastical offices in the city, or who had purchased the right for fifty guilders. The second class, holding the lesser burgerregt, was composed of all born in the city, or who had been resident and kept fire and light for a year and a half, or who kept shop and paid twenty guilders.⁶ Only those who possessed the greater burgerregt were eligible to the municipal offices. Thus the government of New Amsterdam was based upon the aristocratic and hereditary features of the constitution of old Amsterdam. There was no place in this scheme for popular government. It provided for a selection

¹ O'Callaghan, II. 212-216; Brodhead, I. 548-549.

² *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 244.

³ O'Callaghan, II. 311.

⁴ *Records of New Amsterdam*, II. 16, 24-29, 282-286; O'Callaghan, II. 370. A separate schout for New Amsterdam was not appointed until 1660.

⁵ J. F. Jameson, *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, VIII. 321.

⁶ *Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland*, 299-301.

by the outgoing magistrates of a double number of candidates from a very small class of the citizens, and an election by the Director and Council of the requisite number from these candidates and from the old officers. In principle it was the same system as that which we have seen was established in the Dutch towns of New Netherland.

From the facts here given, the following conclusions may be drawn concerning the local government of New Netherland: (1) The Dutch settlements showed slight communal feeling; were with difficulty concentrated into towns; developed little political activity or interest; and finally received (rather than demanded) a form of government which gave scant room for popular control. (2) The English settlements under the Dutch jurisdiction showed a common interest from the first; received land-grants in common; undertook political functions almost unconsciously; demanded and usually received far greater privileges from the Director and Council than were given to the Dutch towns. (3) Although Director Kieft granted liberal charters to the English, Stuyvesant was opposed to this policy, and attempted to cut down the privileges which his predecessor had conceded. After the favoritism shown in the first few years to the English, the attitude of the New Amsterdam authorities changed, and under Stuyvesant there was a continuous opposition to popular government in Dutch and English towns.

ALBERT E. MCKINLEY.

SOME POLITICAL ASPECTS OF HOMESTEAD LEGISLATION

THE policy of disposing of the public lands of the United States under the principles of the homestead law, first adopted in 1862, was the outgrowth of a long period of discussion and experiment in which nearly all possible plans for the administration of the public domain were advocated and many different schemes tried. Of all the diverse methods of disposal, that which was based upon the homestead principle—free grants to settlers who should live upon and cultivate the lands for a certain time—was the last to secure the approval of Congress. Today it is the generally accepted principle of our land legislation, although the rapid decrease in the arable public domain has much lessened its application. It is this feature of our policy which has secured the almost universal approval of impartial students of this part of American history, the only wonder expressed being that such a policy was not sooner adopted. But this wonder vanishes when we find how closely the public domain has been connected with general political questions and in how many ways the homestead policy was in opposition to the political views of different sections of the country. It is my intention to trace the growth of the sentiment favoring the donation of lands on condition of actual settlement, and to show how and why this plan became involved with other seemingly distinct issues of national policy.

At first the public lands were regarded as the basis of a very large revenue, and the plans for their administration were formed with the intention of making that revenue as great as possible. It was perhaps only natural that such should have been the thought at the time when the new government was inaugurated. The country was deeply in debt, the levying of taxes by the national government was not looked at with favor by the states and the public domain seemed to furnish an easy means whereby the debt could be paid and at the same time heavy taxation avoided. And, while it was felt that the sale of the lands would be advantageous because of the money that it would bring, yet the rapid settlement of the western country was considered neither probable nor desirable. A slow and compact settlement was advocated as best both for the old states

and the new territories.¹ So the holding of the public lands for a comparatively high price would serve both the financial and the industrial interests of the country, and no change in this policy was likely to come before the growth of the West had forced upon the East the necessity for such a change.

This growth came much more rapidly than anyone had expected. By 1820 the states which had been carved out of the public domain were seven in number (including Missouri) and had a population of 1,224,384, while Kentucky and Tennessee, with 986,906 inhabitants, were likely to add their weight to the interests of the land states. In most things pertaining to the disposal of the public domain the ideas of these new states were radically different from those of the states which had no public land within their boundaries. The new states did not regard with favor the existence in their limits of large tracts of unoccupied land, the policy of whose owner was to make as much money as possible from it, regardless of the rapidity of settlement. This land was only partially subject to their jurisdiction; over it they could exercise neither the right of taxation nor eminent domain. Any policy which would tend to rapid settlement would have been welcomed by the new states, as the lands would then be both occupied and under the jurisdiction of their laws. Two policies which would have tended towards that result were open to the government: the lowering of the price of the lands with an ultimate gratuitous distribution, or the cession of the lands to the states in which they were situated—the primary desire being to get the lands out of the hands of the government as soon as possible.

The first of these policies contained in an imperfect form the homestead principle, although it was to be applied only to lands which had been long in the market and could presumably be disposed of in no other way. The policy of cession to the states would have allowed the lands to be disposed of at prices calculated to induce rapid immigration and would probably have led, through the almost inevitable competition, to state homestead laws. Of these plans the states preferred that of cession, as likely to serve their immediate interests better; but either was out of the question as long as they relied upon their own unaided efforts. They must appeal to the old states, and for this favor it was to the South rather than to the North that they turned.

For the South had always shown evidences of a better feeling for and a more intimate connection with the West. At the time

¹ See letters of Washington to Duane, September 7, 1783, *Writings* (Ford), X. 303; and to Williamson, March 15, 1785, *ibid.*, 446-447.

when the Confederation was considering plans for the administration of the lands acquired by the state cessions, this division of feeling regarding the West began to appear, the North wishing to retard emigration thither, while the South was inclined to favor it.¹ Such a feeling cannot be said to have been strong, but it continued for nearly fifty years, and during the period from the adoption of the Constitution down to the election of Andrew Jackson it was the South which understood and sympathized with the growing West. The exhibitions of hostility which the West was prone to cite were fancied rather than real, but there can be no doubt that the West was right when it felt that it must turn to the South for aid in its pet enterprises and that the North did not look with favor on its rapid growth.

The causes which led to this connection between the South and West were physiographic. The easiest route across the Appalachian system was from Virginia, through the Great Valley and into Tennessee, or, turning to the northward, down the Kanawha to the Ohio. It was because of this greater ease of communication that the settlers in the West were predominantly Southern until after the war of 1812.² And after the emigrants had reached the new country the natural line of traffic from the West to the sea was down the Mississippi and thus through Southern territory. It was not until the advent of the great railroad systems extending from the valley of the Mississippi to the Atlantic coast, after 1850, that this north-and-south route of commerce was changed for an east-and-west one. Nor was it to the economic advantage of the North, devoted as it was to manufacturing, to encourage the emigration which at last began. But to the agricultural South, on the other hand, the spreading and dispersion of population were especially welcome.

The movement for gratuitous distribution of the public lands did not begin until after 1820. Up to that year the minimum price had been \$2 an acre, with liberal terms of credit, and this figure was found to be low enough, especially as the money was fre-

¹ *Life of Manasseh Cutler*, I. 135-136. The original plan of the Ordinance of 1785 for the disposal of each township in its entirety before the next could be offered for sale was not embodied in the final form of that document. It has frequently been stated that this plan was strongly favored at the North, and the charges of New England hostility to the West were partly based on such an assumption, but there is nothing in the action of Congress to point to such a conclusion. This clause was struck out on motion of a Southern delegate (McHenry, of Maryland), but there was only one Northern vote (from Rhode Island) in favor of its retention. A later motion to re-insert the provision received one vote from Massachusetts, two from Connecticut, one from New York and one from South Carolina. *Journals of Congress*, IV. 513-515, 519.

² See Roosevelt, *Winning of the West*, IV. 220-221.

quently not paid at all, to insure a fairly rapid settlement of the West. In 1820 the credit system was abolished and the price reduced to \$1.25 an acre. This reduction was a step in the right direction, according to the West, but it did not go far enough. If the settlers were to pay cash for their lands that price would, it was maintained, prevent them from coming to the West in any considerable numbers, and the lands would remain in the hands of the government.

The cause of the West in the disposal of the lands was championed by one who came as the first senator from one of the states of the public domain, and who proved a ready advocate for a subject on which he had strong convictions. From 1824 on, Benton was urging upon Congress the reduction and graduation of the price of the lands, and had even gone so far as to propose the donation of them to actual settlers. While he met with but slight success at first he continued his efforts in the belief that public opinion was being educated upon the question.¹ His plan, as presented in a bill introduced in 1826, was for successive annual reductions in the price of lands until twenty-five cents an acre should be reached, after which the remaining lands were to be given to actual settlers. He made no attempt to secure a vote on the bill at this time.²

In 1828 Benton came forward with a new bill in which were combined the various western schemes for the disposition of the public lands. The graduation principle was to be applied to lands until they had been in the market for eight years, after which the settler could buy a quarter-section for eight dollars, and the lands which failed to be taken up then were to be ceded to the states.³ This, said Benton, would please everyone. It would accelerate the sale of the lands and thus the treasury would be benefited; the new states would sooner secure the jurisdiction over the lands, while the donations would aid the poorer classes in securing homes.⁴ But in spite of Benton's plea the Senate, by a vote of 21 to 25, refused to order the bill engrossed. Something of the position of the North on emigration and land-distribution can be learned from the fact that the bill did not receive a vote from a state north of Delaware.⁵

The outlook for the homestead plan was not bright, for it was in the Senate, with its proportionally large Southern and Western representation, that the greatest support for such a plan would

¹ Benton, *Thirty Years' View*, I. 102-103.

² *Register of Debates*, II. pt. I, 567, 719-724.

³ *Ibid.*, IV. pt. I, 497.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 609, 624-626.

⁵ *Senate Journal*, 20th Cong., first session, 323.

probably be found. But at just about this time the cause of the West was advancing rapidly. The election of Jackson in 1828, although no issue concerning the public lands was involved, brought to the head of the government a person who was in all things likely to favor western demands, and was indicative of the growing power of that section. Nor was the West slow to formulate and increase its demands for changes in the land system. At the close of the year Adams noted with deep concern the "graspings of the western states after all the public lands," as reported to him by Clay, who also strongly disapproved of the idea.¹ Almost at the same time Niles spoke of a "simultaneous movement in several of the western states" which had for its object the acquiring of the public lands by those states.²

In spite of the growing strength of the West, Benton was in 1830 not able to secure the assent of the Senate to his bill until it had been amended so that only a reduction to one dollar was provided for. Even in this amended form the North was against the bill and in the vote of 24 to 22 only one vote in its favor came from a state north of Virginia.³ Benton was, however, satisfied with the concession, as the further reductions in his original bill would not have begun to operate at once and he was confident of securing supplemental legislation from the next Congress.⁴ He was very optimistic regarding his plans and maintained that the doctrines of donation to actual settlers and cession to the states had made great progress by 1833.⁵ Adams indicated his fears that the old policy regarding the public lands, to which he clung as a New Englander, would be abandoned.⁶ But the House with its overwhelming Eastern majority, refused even to consider the bill.⁷

But it is not to the graduation bill but to an innocent-looking resolution offered by Foot, of Connecticut, that we must look for exhibition of the real sentiment on the public lands. This resolution, famous for the debate on the theory of sovereignty which it occasioned, inquired into the advisability of limiting for a time the further sales of the lands. Should the policy to which it pointed be adopted it would be a direct blow at the desires and hopes of the Western states and particularly at the plans advocated by Benton.

¹ Adams, *Memoirs*, VIII. 87-88 (December 31, 1828).

² *Niles's Register*, XXXV. 313 (January 10, 1829).

³ *Senate Journal*, 21st Cong., first session, 292.

⁴ *Register of Debates*, VI. pt. 1, 413.

⁵ Benton, *Thirty Years' View*, I. 275.

⁶ "In conversing with Mr. Rush upon the prospects of the country, we agreed that the Indians are already sacrificed; that the public lands will be given away;" etc. Adams, *Memoirs*, VIII. 229 (May 22, 1830).

⁷ *Register of Debates*, VI. pt. 1, 1148.

That senator was not slow to answer the attack. He assumed at once the position that the North, and particularly New England, had originated this idea, and in more than one fiery speech he denounced the policy which that section had, he asserted, always pursued towards the West. It had constantly desired to limit and restrain the growth of the West; it had attempted to secure the adoption of a land-policy which would only allow of a gradual settlement of that part of the country; it had been willing to surrender the navigation of the Mississippi; it had neglected and even refused to afford the settlers adequate protection from the Indians, and was even now endeavoring to limit emigration that its manufactures might be further developed. And by whom had the West been rescued when the hostile North was thus attempting to crush out its very life? By the South was Benton's answer.¹ We have seen that there was some basis for Benton's assertions, though he was by no means warranted in going as far as he did. But the South was at this time willing to assume the rôle which Benton ascribed to it, and Hayne continued the discussion in much the same strain. From this time the debate forgot the public lands entirely and passed into the wide realm of the interpretation of the Constitution. The fact that a resolution in regard to the disposal of the public lands could cause such a constitutional discussion shows to what an extent the land question was involved with other national issues and emphasizes the sectional aspects of this question.

In 1830 many things seemed to be working towards the speedy enactment of some sort of homestead law. In addition to the increase of the power of the West the financial condition of the country favored the policy of free gifts of the public lands. Up to this time the opponents of this policy or of the cessions of lands to the states had been able to rest their case on the argument that the lands were an important source of revenue and that this revenue was needed to pay the public debt. But now the public debt was being rapidly paid off and other grounds must be found for this opposition.

In view of the extinction of the debt Jackson took a stand in favor of a policy which should bring about the rapid settlement of the lands. He advocated this in his message of December, 1832, although he did not favor in full the principle of the homestead bill, but advised the sale of the lands to settlers at only enough to cover the cost of administration.² Such a policy accorded not only with Jackson's ideas regarding the West but also with his position on

¹ *Register of Debates*, VI. Pt. I, 24-27, 102.

² *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, II. 601.

other matters of public policy, as, favoring an economical administration, he was strongly opposed to a surplus revenue which might be used to further internal improvements.¹ In this he was in harmony with the South and the Democratic party, while the now forming Whig party favored a surplus. The matter was, however, complicated by the fact that if the revenue from the public lands should be kept up it would allow the reduction of the tariff, a measure favored by the Democrats and opposed by the Whigs. But the enactment of the compromise tariff of 1833 removed this issue from politics for some years, so that it appeared that the public land question might be settled on its own merits.

Accordingly, if the West had remained firm in its demand for the public lands it seems likely that it would have secured them either by means of a homestead law or by cessions to the states. The strongest objection to these measures would have come from the New England states, while the support of Jackson and the South could probably have been secured. Adams was of the opinion that an active Western and Southern alliance existed and that the public lands were to be given to the states.²

But the West did not hold firm to the position which it had taken. The action of one of its leaders completely changed its policy and committed the Whig party to a definite line of action in opposition to cessions to the states and homestead grants. In 1832 the request of the Western states for the public lands had been referred to the committee on manufactures, of which Clay was chairman, and he had reported in favor of the distribution of the proceeds from the land-sales among all the states. Without considering in detail the efforts to secure such a distribution, it is evident that this would effectually prevent either a homestead law or the cession of the lands to the states.³

But even if the government would not reduce the price of the lands the Western states had devised a way by which they could be obtained cheaply. The large issues of notes of the state banks, which were accepted in payment for lands until the specie circular of July 11, 1836, enabled one to purchase lands with comparative ease. Then came the crisis of 1837, and for a time the desire for lands at any price was removed.

¹ *Ibid.*, 597-598.

² "That debate [on Foot's resolution] was one of the earliest results of that coalition between the South and the West to sacrifice the manufacturing and free-labor interests of the North and East to the slave-holding interests of the South, by the plunder of the western lands surrendered by the South to the Western States." Adams, *Memoirs*, IX. 235 (April 19, 1835).

³ On the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands see Sato, *Land Question in the United States*, Johns Hopkins University Studies, IV. 411-417.

From the time of Clay's report on the distribution of the proceeds in 1832, nothing is heard of homestead grants until 1845. Yet there is through this period a constantly increasing tendency to consider the actual settler in administering the public lands. In 1837 a bill to prohibit the sale of lands to any but actual settlers passed the Senate by a vote of 27 to 23,¹ but was laid on the table in the House, 107 to 91.² In the next Congress the changing sentiment was manifested by the passage of a graduation bill by the Senate by the decisive vote of 27 to 16,³ while in the House another such bill received a favorable report from the committee on public lands,⁴ although it never came to a vote. At this time the land policies of Texas and Canada were contrasted with those of the United States.⁵ Further efforts to reduce and graduate the price of the lands were made during the next Congresses, but these, like their predecessors, failed in the House. The question had quieted down for a time and the chief importance of these bills is the indication which the votes upon them give of a gradual change in sectional sentiment, by which the North came to favor and the South to oppose the encouragement of Western emigration. The greatest gain to the actual settlers came in 1841 by the passage of a permanent pre-emption law.⁶

During this period there was no fixed and definite land policy. The passage of Clay's distribution bill in 1841 may be taken as indicating a policy hostile to a reduction in the price of lands, as there would then be much less to be distributed.⁷ The homestead policy was, however, applied in an isolated case by the "Florida Donation Act" of 1842.⁸ This granted quarter-sections to actual settlers, such an inducement being considered necessary because of the danger from the Indians.⁹

The position which the parties took in 1844 on the land question shows that the homestead policy was not actively considered by either at this time. The Whigs favored and the Democrats opposed the distribution of the proceeds, but beyond this the platforms did not go. It was asserted at a later time that the result of the election was a verdict for the reduction and graduation of the

¹ *Senate Journal*, 24th Cong., second session, 233.

² *House Journal*, 24th Cong., second session, 561.

³ *Senate Journal*, 25th Cong., second session, 356.

⁴ *Globe*, 25th Cong., second session, 60-61.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 294. Texas offered 640 acres to each head of a family and 120 acres to each single man. Gouge, *Fiscal History of Texas*, 93.

⁶ See Sato, *Land Question*, 417-421.

⁷ See *Globe*, 28th Cong., second session, 248, 249.

⁸ *Statutes at Large*, V. 502.

⁹ *Globe*, 27th Cong., second session, 623-624, 764-766.

price of the lands,¹ but there is nothing to show that anything more than the distribution was in issue in this campaign, and this was of very minor importance.² The question before the people was not how to dispose of the land which we already had but how to acquire more. Texas and Oregon, not distribution and homesteads, were the issues of the campaign.

But new territories having been acquired, the problem of their settlement at once arose. While the paramount question was whether the settlers could take their slaves with them, yet the plan of offering inducements for Western immigration began to push to the front, although it was not so much for the new territories as for the old ones that the latter question was agitated. The decade 1840-50, particularly its latter half, was a period of constantly increasing emigration from Europe to the United States. A great share of this new population went into the states and territories of the Northwest, which show an astonishing rate of increase during those ten years.³ That a still greater increase might be secured, the movement for homesteads was taken up in earnest by the Western states.

Yet this new movement for free grants was not to come at first from the land states but from a state which had no public lands. In 1845 Thomasson, of Kentucky, had introduced a bill making donations of forty acres to actual settlers who were heads of families. He very frankly stated that one of his chief objects was to remove the public-land fund from the national treasury, as he did not wish a revenue from the lands sufficient to give an excuse for breaking down the protective system.⁴ The next year two amendments having for their object the securing of homesteads for actual settlers were offered to graduation bills. One of these came from Darragh, of Pennsylvania, and provided for the donation of lands which had been in the market for ten years or more to actual settlers after a three years' occupation,⁵ and the other from Johnson, of Tennessee, making grants of quarter-sections to destitute heads of families who should occupy them for four years.⁶ Both of these plans were limited in their application, the first as regards the lands and the second as regards the settlers, but neither secured the assent of the House.

¹ By Bowlin, of Missouri, July 6, 1846. *Globe*, 29th Cong., first session, 1061-1062.

² Vinton, of Ohio, declared that the public lands had never been a party question. *Ibid.*, 1076.

³ Wisconsin increased 886 per cent. during this decade; Iowa 199 per cent.; Michigan 87 per cent.; Illinois 79 per cent.

⁴ *Globe*, 28th Cong., second session, 241.

⁵ *Globe*, 29th Cong., first session, 1077.

⁶ *Ibid.*

During the next Congress various bills were introduced looking toward the homestead principle, either attempting to prevent speculation in the public lands¹ or making grants to actual settlers;² but none of these received any consideration. But the issue of homesteads, if not considered in Congress, was presented in very definite form to the people by the new Free-Soil party in its Buffalo convention of 1848.³ While this party did not represent any considerable number of voters, yet on this particular question it was in harmony with many members of the old parties, neither of which antagonized the position which the Free-Soilers had taken.

In 1850 an important step in land policy was taken in the enactment of the first railroad-land-grant law, which donated lands to Illinois, Mississippi and Alabama for a railroad from Chicago to Mobile. While the plan for this grant had originated in the West and was strongly supported there it also received some opposition from that section because it was felt that the possession of large tracts of lands by corporations and the increase (to \$2.50 an acre) in the price of the remaining public lands within six miles of the proposed road would operate to the disadvantage of the settler. An unsuccessful effort was made to strike out this increase of price,⁴ but no further opposition to railroad land-grants from the homestead standpoint was now developed.

At this time two propositions for homestead grants were made in the Senate. The one, by Walker of Wisconsin, was for a cession of the lands to the states, on condition that they be granted in limited quantities to actual settlers for the cost of administration.⁵ The other, from Douglas, was for grants of 160 acres to actual settlers after a residence and cultivation of four years.⁶ The committee on public lands reported against both bills. In general, they considered that the public lands should be administered for the benefit of the treasury and that that system of disposal which would bring the greatest financial return should be adopted. The public lands were pledged for the payment of the public debt and so could

¹ *Globe*, 30th Cong., first session, 916, 181, 583.

² *Ibid.*, 25, 605.

³ "Resolved, That the free grant to actual settlers, in consideration of the expenses they incur in making settlements in the wilderness, which are usually fully equal to their actual cost, and of the public benefits resulting therefrom, of reasonable portions of the public lands, under suitable limitations, is a wise and just measure of public policy which will promote, in various ways, the interests of all the States of the Union." Stanwood, *History of the Presidency*, 241.

⁴ See my *Congressional Grants of Land in Aid of Railways*, Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, Economics, Political Science and History Series, II., no. 3, pp. 31-32.

⁵ *Senate Journal*, 31st Cong., first session, 116.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 36.

not in justice to the public debtors be given away. The plan would also be unjust to those who already held land in the new states, as so much free land placed upon the market would at once reduce land values. The committee further held that not only had the government no right thus to decrease the value of farm lands, but it was especially estopped because of the effect which such an action would have on the grants recently made for internal improvements of various kinds.¹ The antagonism between the homestead system and the beneficiaries under the internal improvement grants was thus sharply brought out.

During the next Congress the public land question was most prominent of all. It was between the advocates of homesteads and the railroad land-grants that the chief conflict occurred. Governor Farwell of Wisconsin, in his message of 1852, argued that the grants for railroads injured rather than benefited the Western states, because of the inclusion, in the grants, of the most valuable portions of the public lands and the consequent retarding of settlement.² On the other side it was stated that the only formidable opposition to the homestead bills came from the friends of land-grants,³ and that, while the House was opposed to the land-grant bills, they might be passed by compromises with those who were more opposed to grants to settlers.⁴ On comparing the vote on the homestead bill with that on a typical land-grant bill it will be found that the members divide into three classes of almost equal strength, one opposed to the one and in favor of the other measure, a second opposed to both plans and a third favoring both.⁵

The tariff question again appeared in connection with the homestead grants. In 1850 and 1852 charges were made in the debates over the bills that their supporters wished to accomplish what Thomasson had in 1845 frankly stated to be his object, the creation of a need for high tariff duties.⁶ It is quite probable that such influences were at work in the minds of some of the Whigs, but that party still retained its love for the distribution of the proceeds,⁷ which would have accomplished the same object as the homestead law as far as the effect on the treasury was concerned.

The discussions over the homestead question in the Congressional session of 1851-52 exhibited also some manifestations of

¹ *Senate Reports*, 31st Cong., first session, No. 167.

² *Wisconsin Assembly Journal*, fifth session, 30-31.

³ *Globe*, 32nd Cong., first session, App., 574.

⁴ Pike in the *Semi-Weekly Tribune*, March 19, 1852.

⁵ See my *Grants in Aid of Railways*, 46-49.

⁶ *Globe*, 31st Cong., first session, 264; 32nd Cong., first session, App., 238.

⁷ See Wentworth, *Congressional Reminiscences*, Fergus Historical Series, No. 24, p. 40.

that spirit which was to break out two years later in the form of Know-Nothingism. The bill as introduced in the House would have granted lands to all citizens of the United States who should comply with its provisions. To this an amendment was offered which restricted its benefits to native-born citizens or to those who had declared their intention of becoming citizens prior to the first of January, 1852. This amendment was offered by Johnson and was supported by a number of other members of the House because they did not wish to encourage immigration by the bill;¹ but Johnson finally withdrew it.²

During the next Congress the restriction as to citizens was a part of the proposed bill, and the efforts to remove it met with violent opposition. Washburn of Illinois had proposed to allow anyone who had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen to enter land under the bill, as this would encourage immigration; but this proposal was disagreed to without a division.³ Wade then wished to remove all restrictions as to citizenship, but in this he was strongly opposed by several members, including Adams of Mississippi, who referred to the anti-slavery position which the foreigners were taking, and Thompson of Kentucky, who made a severe attack on the immigrants, although he declared that he was not a "Native American" in the political sense of the term.⁴ Wade saw that his amendment would endanger and probably defeat the bill, and he withdrew it.⁵ But even then the bill was objectionable to those members of Congress who were tainted with "Americanism," for another section contained the provision that any person who had, at the time of the passage of the act, declared his intention of becoming a citizen should be entitled to the benefit of its provisions. This section was attacked. The assertion was made that the passage of the bill in that form would contribute to the growth of the Native American party, particularly in the South.⁶ The *National Intelligencer*⁷ characterized the bill as one which would "draw to our shores the poverty and crime of every clime and kingdom" of Europe. But in spite of these dire predictions the motion to strike out this section was defeated, 19 to 29.⁸

As if the cause of homesteads were not having troubles enough at this time, the question of the extension of slavery, now agitating

¹ *Globe*, 32nd Cong., first session, 1275-1284.

² *Ibid.*, 1315.

³ *Globe*, 33d Cong., first session, 529.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 944-948.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1661.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 1705.

⁷ July 20, 1854.

⁸ *Senate Journal*, 33d Cong., first session, 516.

Congress in the form of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, came up to vex it. Some fears were expressed that free negroes might take advantage of the homestead act, but on this the opinion was quite generally expressed that the limitation as to citizens was sufficient, as negroes could not possibly be included under that designation. But to make the matter perfectly sure the word white was inserted in the bill; not, however, so that it would read "white citizens," a redundant expression in the ears of the Southerners, but "white persons."¹ But that the restriction to whites did not reconcile the slave states is shown clearly in the vote in the House, where the members from the free states were 74 to 31 for the bill and the members from the slave states 41 to 33 against it, and of these 33 votes 21 came from the border states of Tennessee, Kentucky and Missouri.²

One of the opponents of the bill from the slave states saw clearly why it was for the interest of his section to take the position which it took. Johnson, of Arkansas, stated in the Senate that he had formerly favored the bill, but that he could not support it because "just at this time it is tinctured, to a degree, from its inevitable effects, and under the peculiar circumstances, so strongly with abolitionism." The style is involved but the meaning is clear, and he went on to explain that the lands north of the Missouri Compromise line where only northern men could go were being opened up for settlement, while those south of the line were still closed, and so the bill was being pushed at this time in order that the territorial question might be settled in favor of the North.³ But this objection was being removed at this very time, for the Kansas-Nebraska bill had passed the Senate and was under discussion in the House with every prospect of its early passage. What Johnson did not say but what he must have realized was, that it was the Northern farmer, rather than the Southern slaveholder, who would be induced to go into the territories by such a law.

During the debates on this bill it was declared to be the true Democratic doctrine, that the lands should be sold and the proceeds placed in the treasury, the revenue thus derived permitting a lower tariff.⁴ The Democrats, however, favored the bill, voting for it, 72 to 52, and the Whigs took a similar position by a vote of 35 to 19. The only Free-Soiler in the House voted against it.⁵

The House had, for some years, annually passed the homestead bill, and the Senate had as regularly defeated it. But in 1854, the

¹ *Globe*, 33d Cong., first session, 503-504.

² *House Journal*, 33d Cong., first session, 458.

³ *Globe*, 33d Cong., first session, 1125.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 459.

⁵ *House Journal*, 33d Cong., first session, 458.

Senate, instead of directly voting the bill down, set it aside and passed a substitute which provided that any free white person, head of a family, should be entitled to enter on a quarter-section of public land and after five years' occupation and cultivation purchase it for twenty-five cents an acre. This substitute contained a number of other provisions, for the right of pre-emption by the states, for a general grant of land to the states for the building of railroads, etc.¹ It seems to have been supported by both the friends and the opponents of the regular homestead bill.² This bill went back to the House, but was not acted upon there.

It was not until about four years later that the question of homesteads again came before Congress. Early in the session which began in the fall of 1857 a bill for free grants was introduced into the Senate but was postponed after a short discussion to January, 1859. There was some factious opposition expressed in a proposition to give to any head of a family a land-warrant for 160 acres, that he might enjoy the benefits of the act without leaving his home and going to the West.³ The doctrine of *laissez faire* was brought up as opposed to the principle of the bill; it was declared that a person's self-interest should be sufficient to cause the settlement of the new lands as rapidly as was good for the country.⁴ Johnson attempted to remove the feeling which he said existed in the South that the homestead bill was a sort of Emigrant Aid Society, by showing that the bill had been before Congress since 1846, before there was, as he expressed it, any question of slavery.⁵

At the short session of this Congress the House passed a homestead bill by a vote of 120 to 76. The sectional and party divisions are particularly significant at this time, as they show clearly the intimate connection between slavery and the question of territorial expansion as expressed in the proposed bill. That the bill was a northern Emigrant Aid measure can be doubted by no one who remembers the slowness with which the Southerners could be induced to move into the territories, and the corresponding willingness of the Northerners to migrate even without homestead inducements. Both sections were alive to this aspect of the bill; only 7 votes from the free states were cast against it and only 5 votes from the slave states for it. The Democrats were 38 to 60 against it and the Republicans 82 to 1 in its favor. The fear that the bill would encourage immigration was shown in the votes of the 15 Americans

¹ *Globe*, 33d Cong., first session, App., 1122.

² See my *Grants in Aid of Railways*, 50-51.

³ *Globe*, 35th Cong., first session, 2240.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, 2265.

against the measure.¹ The New York *Tribune* enumerated, as the forces which were opposed to the bill, slavery, railroad grants and bounty land-warrants, the last because homesteads would decrease the value of the warrants.²

The bill which the Senate had postponed from the previous session had not been considered. On February 17, 1859, the House bill came up. A motion to postpone it stood 28 to 28; the Vice-President, Breckenridge, voted in the affirmative and so the matter was put off for the moment. On February 25, the Senate had under consideration the bill to appropriate \$30,000,000 for the purchase of Cuba. The time was particularly inopportune for the forcing of a discussion on a measure so opposed to the slavery interests as the homestead bill, but Doolittle of Wisconsin moved to lay the Cuba bill aside and take up the other. Johnson, Douglas and Rice, all supporters of the homestead bill, requested Doolittle to withdraw his motion, as it only served to antagonize the friends of the Cuba bill. Doolittle refused, and the discussion between the slavery and anti-slavery elements in the Senate grew warm. Toombs asserted that the opponents of the Cuba bill were attempting to dodge the issue by killing the bill under the guise of a postponement. Wade denied the charge and said that the anti-slavery men were willing to meet the issue, which he stated as: "Shall we give niggers to the niggerless or lands to the landless?" It was evident that the two measures were in flat opposition, not only as regards precedence on that evening but in their ultimate principles, which Seward more decorously stated as follows: "The homestead bill is a question of homes, of homes for the landless freemen of the United States. The Cuba bill is a question of slaves for the slaveholders of the United States." The motion to take up the homestead bill failed by a vote of 19 to 29, only one person from a slave state, Johnson of Tennessee, voting in favor of it. By almost the same vote (18 to 30) the Senate refused to lay the Cuba bill on the table, the difference being due to the change in Johnson's vote.³

The Southern opposition was not, however, all due to the effect which a homestead act would have on the slavery question. Under

¹ *House Journal*, 35th Cong., second session, 309. I use the classification of the *Tribune Almanac* for 1859. "The slaveholders voted against it because they despise free labor, and the doughfaces because they love to serve the slaveholders. The South Americans voted against the bill because it allowed aliens, who had only declared their intention of becoming citizens, to participate in its benefits." New York *Semi-Weekly Tribune*, February 8, 1859.

² *Ibid.*

³ See *Globe*, 35th Cong., second session, 1351-1354, 1363. By the time the vote was taken on the Cuba bill two senators who had voted on the homestead bill were paired and there was a vote from Maryland for and one from Oregon against the bill.

a strict construction of the Constitution it was held that Congress could not give away the public lands or use them to further any objects which could not be aided by a direct appropriation. The provision of the Constitution that "The Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belong to the United States,"¹ was considered as limited by the enumerated powers granted to Congress so that nothing could be done with the lands which was not specified in those enumerated powers. This had been one of the grounds taken by Pierce in his veto of the act granting lands for support of hospitals for the insane, passed by Congress in 1854.² The same objection was made to grants in aid of colleges³ and was only obviated in the grants for railroads by the alternate-section principle, whereby the lands remaining to the government within the limits of the grant were doubled in price so that there was in theory no loss to the government.⁴ Some of the homestead bills, but not all, also contained this alternate-section principle, in the form of a restriction of the entries to the odd-numbered sections, but the remaining sections were of course not doubled in price. The bill which passed Congress in 1860 and which was vetoed by Buchanan bore this form.⁵ Little attention seems to have been paid to this provision and it did not overcome, as in the case of the railroad grants, the objections of the strict constructionists.

At the next Congress the homestead bill passed the House after but little discussion. Sectionally and politically the vote was divided almost as before. Of the 115 voting for the bill 90 were Republicans and 25 Democrats, and the 66 opposed to it were 49 Democrats and 17 Americans. Pennsylvania was the only free state from which a vote was cast against the bill and Missouri the

¹ Art. IV., Sec. III.

² "I respectfully submit that in a constitutional point of view it is wholly immaterial whether the appropriation be in money or in land.

"The public domain is the common property of the Union just as much as the surplus proceeds of that and of duties on imports remaining unexpended in the Treasury. As such it has been pledged, is now pledged, and may need to be so pledged again for public indebtedness.

"As property it is distinguished from actual money chiefly in this respect, that its profitable management sometimes requires that portions of it be appropriated to local objects in the States wherein it may happen to lie, as would be done by any prudent proprietor to enhance the sale value of his private domain. All such grants are in fact a disposal of it for value received, but they afford no precedent or constitutional reason for giving away the public lands." *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, V. 253-254.

³ See Knight, *Land Grants for Education in the Northwest Territory*, Papers of the American Historical Association, I. 97.

⁴ See my *Grants in Aid of Railways*, 86.

⁵ Donaldson, *Public Domain*, 340.

only slave state with a vote for it.¹ The provision allowing the entry of 80 acres of land held at \$2.50 an acre partly opened up the reserved lands in the railroad grants, but 160 acres of the \$1.25 lands could be taken up by the homesteader. Not until 1879 could the latter amount of the reserved lands be entered under the proposed act.

It was evident that the bill could not pass the Senate, and therefore Johnson proposed a substitute which gave to actual settlers the right of pre-emption at twenty-five cents an acre. A test vote on the homestead principle itself was furnished by the motion of Wade to substitute the original House bill, but this was lost 26 to 31, with votes from three free states, Pennsylvania, California and Oregon, against it.² The bill was then passed with only eight votes against it, seven of which were from the slave states.³ The House at first refused to recede from its original bill but finally yielded to the Senate, considering that it was doing the best thing possible under the circumstances.⁴ But even this concession to the friends of homesteads was not destined to become law, for Buchanan returned it to the Senate without his approval and the attempt to pass it over the veto failed, 27 to 18.⁵

Buchanan considered that the price charged would be merely nominal, so that the measure would be open to the same objections as a direct grant. That such a grant was unconstitutional Buchanan had already held in his veto of the agricultural college land-grant bill.⁶ Congress was a trustee of the public lands, and when it was authorized by the Constitution to "dispose of" them, such a power was limited by the purposes for which the government was created, by the enumerated powers of Congress. He also considered the bill unjust to those who had already settled in the West and who had paid a much higher price for the lands. The holders of bounty land-warrants could also object, for the value of those instruments would be reduced by the bill. It was further unjust in that it confined its benefits to one class of the people; in that it would offer inducements for emigration from the old states, and because it would encourage immigration from abroad. Buchanan considered that the old system of holding the lands for revenue should be retained, and estimated that from them an annual income of \$10,000,000 could be obtained.⁷

¹ *House Journal*, 36th Cong., first session, 502.

² *Senate Journal*, 36th Cong., first session, 447.

³ *Ibid.*, 458.

⁴ *Globe*, 36th Cong., first session, 3179.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 3272.

⁶ *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, V. 543.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 608-614.

This argument of Buchanan's against the homestead bill is a decidedly weak one. In the constitutional part of it he followed Pierce in his veto of the grant for the insane, but he did not state that argument with the same force as his predecessor. And that argument, in its best form, was valid only on a very strict interpretation of the Constitution, an interpretation which every American statesman had exceeded time and again. Much of the remainder of his argument is based on the assumption that the labor of five years which the settler must expend on the land before he could obtain a clear title to it was no return to the government for the lands donated, whereas it is probably no exaggeration to say that the improvement and settlement of the land was of greater value to the country than the price of the land would have been; for in the case of outright sales there was no guarantee that the land would be settled or cultivated. As for the immigration problem, the foreigner who was attracted by the prospect of five years' labor on the frontier has proved the most desirable settler that the country has obtained from abroad.

The next Congress showed very little opposition to the homestead bill and it at last became a law, May 20, 1862. Its passage attracted little attention in the war time, but its wisdom has never been seriously questioned and the only amendments have been intended to increase its efficiency and liberality.

During the period of more than forty years throughout which the homestead bills, in one form or another, were before Congress the most manifold opposition was manifested to them. At first they had to contend with the feeling that to give away any of the public lands would be to waste a large source of revenue at a time when the country needed all the money it could obtain to pay its debts. When the need of the revenue became less pressing it was proposed to keep up the fund from the lands and then distribute it among the states. The actual settler was being more favored in the land legislation, but the efforts, feeble up to 1848, to obtain the lands for him without cost met with no success. After 1848 the movement increased in force but it found stronger forces in opposition to it. The advocate of state-sovereignty and strict construction saw in the homestead act an increase in the power of the general government and therefore gave his aid to its defeat. To the Know-Nothing it was an inducement to foreigners to come to our country and bring with them subservience to the Pope. And, strongest opponent of all, the slaveholder saw that free homesteads meant the rapid settlement of the lands by the people of the North and the passing of the territories from his hands forever. He found himself defeated

in the struggle for Kansas even without the homestead law to aid the Northern emigrant ; with it, he saw, the North would be invincible. With all this powerful opposition is it any wonder that bills which benefited directly only a class of citizens having little political influence should have waited so long to become law ?

JOHN BELL SANBORN.

THE BUFORD EXPEDITION TO KANSAS

By the Kansas-Nebraska Act passed by Congress in 1854, the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska were organized and thrown open to settlement with the proviso that all questions relating to slavery were to be decided by the people of each territory when it should be ready for admission into the Union as a state. The South conceded and the North was sure of the admission of Nebraska as a free state. In the case of Kansas it was doubtful if the anti-slavery party would ever be strong enough to control the elections, but the leaders at the North intended to make a fight to secure Kansas. Consequently there was great excitement in different sections of the country, especially at the North, where, almost before the bill became a law, Emigrant Aid Societies were formed whose object was to assist emigrants opposed to the institution of slavery to go to the territory and settle in order to be ready to vote at the proper time. In this movement of importing men the North had nearly two years the start, the South being confident that no exertion would be necessary in order to secure Kansas as a slave state. So there was very little pro-slavery emigration into this "debatable land" before late in 1855 except from the neighboring state of Missouri.

The first territorial elections were in favor of the Southern party, but the Emigrant Aid Societies in the Northern states kept pouring men and arms into the territory until late in 1855 the outlook was gloomy for the pro-slavery cause.

Pro-slavery Emigrant Aid Societies were now organized in Missouri, and soon other similar societies were formed in the remaining Southern states. Missouri appealed to her sister states in the South to come to her assistance. For two years she had borne the burden alone and would still do her utmost for the integrity of the South.

"But the time has come when she [Missouri] can no longer stand up single-handed, the lone champion of the South, against the myrmidons of the North. It requires no foresight to perceive that if the 'higher law' men succeed in this crusade, it will be but the beginning of a war upon the institutions of the South, which will continue until slavery shall cease to exist in any of the states, or the Union is dissolved.

"The great struggle will come off at the next election in October, 1856, and unless at that time the South can maintain her ground all will

be lost. We repeat it, the Crisis has arrived. The time has come for action—bold, determined action. Words will no longer do any good; we must have men in Kansas, and that by tens of thousands. A few will not answer. If we should need ten thousand men and lack one of that number, all will count nothing. Let all then who can come do so at once. Those who cannot come must give their money to help others to come. . . . We tell you now, and tell you frankly, that unless you come quickly, and come by thousands, we are gone. The elections once lost are lost forever.”¹

With Kansas a free state, Missouri and the states west of the Mississippi would soon be abolitionized, then Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia, until finally slavery would be shut up in a few states on the Gulf and South Atlantic.²

In all sections of the country, during the fall and winter of 1855, there was excitement and agitation over the Kansas question. The South was now thoroughly canvassed by agents of the pro-slavery Emigrant Aid Societies. Bands of men were made ready to start for the territory in the early spring. Alabama, South Carolina, and Georgia took the lead among the slave states in the work of sending men to Kansas to settle and vote for the interests of the South.

In Alabama the first body of pioneers for Kansas was enrolled by Thomas J. Orme, who on November 18, 1855, made this proposition: “If the people of Alabama will raise \$100,000.00, I will land in Kansas 500 settlers. I have over one hundred volunteers now.”³ Nothing resulted from Orme’s proposition, but on November 26, 1855, Major Jefferson Buford, a lawyer of Eufaula, who had served with distinction in the Indian War of 1836, published the following call:

Aid to Kansas. Col. Buford’s Propositions.

“To Kansas Emigrants—

Who will go to Kansas? I wish to raise three hundred industrious, sober, discreet, reliable men capable of bearing arms, not prone to use them wickedly or unnecessarily, but willing to protect their sections in every real emergency. I desire to start with them for Kansas by the 20th of February next. To such I will guaranty the donation of a homestead of forty acres of first rate land, a free passage to Kansas and the means of support for one year. To ministers of the gospel, mechanics, and those with good military or agricultural outfits, I will offer greater inducements. Besides devoting twenty thousand dollars of my own means to this enterprise I expect all those who know and have confidence in me and who feel an interest in the cause, to contribute as much as they are able. I will give to each contributor my obligation that for every fifty dollars contributed I will within six months thereafter place in Kansas one bona fide settler, able and willing to vote and fight

¹ An appeal to the South from the Kansas Emigration Society of Missouri, published in the Southern newspapers. *Advertiser and Gazette* (Montgomery, Ala.), 1855.

² *Charleston Mercury*, 1855.

³ *Advertiser and State Gazette*.

if need be for our section, or in default of doing so, that I will on demand refund the donation with interest from the day of its receipt. I will keep an account of the obligations so issued, and each successive one shall specify one emigrant more than its immediate predecessor,—thus: No. 1 shall pledge me to take one emigrant; No. 2, two; No. 3, three, etc., and if the state makes a contribution it shall be divided into sums of fifty dollars each and numbered accordingly. Here is your cheapest and surest chance to do something for Kansas,—something toward holding against the free-soil hordes that great Thermopylae of Southern institutions. In this their great day of darkness, nay, of extreme peril, there ought to be, there needs must be great individual self-sacrifice, or they cannot be maintained. If we cannot find many who are willing to incur great individual loss in the common cause, if we cannot find some crazy enough to peril even life in the deadly breach, then it is not because individuals have grown more prudent and wise, but because public virtue has decayed and we have thereby already become unequal to the successful defense of our rights.

J. BUFORD.¹

November 26, 1855.

In a letter written near the close of December,² Major Buford describes the prospective settlers whom he had already enrolled as “honest, clever, poor young men from the country, used to agricultural labor, with a few merchants, mechanics, printers, and carpenters.”

The organization of the party was to be military, with officers corresponding to those of the regular service, the officers below the rank of captain to be elected by the emigrants. By a majority vote a company could expel a member. Four places of rendezvous were appointed: Eufaula, Silver Run (now Seale), Columbus, Ga., and Montgomery. A date was set for assembling at each of these places, and the issue of rations began on that day.³

On his return Buford was to make a report giving the name and place of enrollment of each settler, and showing where in Kansas he was left. Contributions were asked for and those who could not contribute in cash were asked to do so in notes, thus:

Cross Road P. O., Barbour Co., Ala., January 1, 1856.

One year after date I promise to pay to Jefferson Buford ——— per head for every emigrant he may take to Kansas within that time, provided that I shall in no event be liable to pay over ——— dollars.

(Signed) _____⁴

¹ Published in the Eufaula *Spirit of the South* and copied on request in other Southern papers. The time of departure was subsequently changed to a date about the first of April, when the rivers should be free from ice.

² Eufaula *Spirit of the South*, copied in *Advertiser and State Gazette* of December 29, 1855.

³ *Alabama Journal*, February 1, 1856.

⁴ Letter from Buford in *Advertiser and State Gazette*, December 29, 1855.

January 7, 1856, forty plantation slaves were sold by Major Buford in Montgomery (at the average price of seven hundred dollars), and the proceeds put into the fund for defraying the expenses of the expedition. Donations were coming in, and Wm. L. Yancey was appointed to receive contributions. The state was thoroughly canvassed by Buford and others during the month of February.¹ Alpheus Baker made some of his wonderfully persuasive speeches in Georgia and South Carolina in the interest of the crusade. William L. Yancey, Henry D. Clayton, LeRoy Pope Walker and Henry W. Hilliard delivered addresses to the people of Alabama, calling for good and true men to protect Southern rights on the Kansas battleground. Representative F. K. Beck of Wilcox County introduced a bill in the state legislature to appropriate \$25,000 for the purpose of aiding emigrants to settle in Kansas. The bill was referred to the Committee on Federal Relations, and was never reported upon.²

Early in January Major Buford made a speech in Montgomery before the state legislature in which he explained his plans for securing Kansas to the South. A citizen of Worcester, Massachusetts, Wm. T. Merrifield, was in Montgomery at the time and heard of the designs of Buford. He at once returned to Massachusetts, told Eli Thayer, the originator of the Emigrant Aid Societies, about Buford's plans, and arranged with him to send men to oppose this Southern force. One hundred and sixty-five men well armed with Sharp's rifles (Beecher's Bibles)³ were sent to Kansas for this purpose.⁴

It was intended that the Buford party should go armed, but in March Major Buford announced that in deference to the President's proclamation,⁵ and in consonance with the true designs of the expedition, it would go unarmed.⁶

The Eufaula contingent left that place on March 31, accompanied by Alpheus Baker, who at all resting-points made addresses of encouragement to the men. Passing through Columbus, Ga., and taking with him a company of fifty men from that town, Major Buford reached Montgomery on April 4. There were now collected here about four hundred men, of whom one hundred were

¹ Buford's appointments were: Cahaba, Woodville, Benton, Lowndesboro, Mt. Willing, Greenville, Valleyton, Troy, Elba, Geneva, Daleville, Newton, Waterford, Columbia, Franklin, Abbeville.

² *Advertiser and State Gazette*, January 13, 1856.

³ "Border Ruffian" name for Sharp's rifles.

⁴ *Worcester Spy*, 1887. See Thayer's *Kansas Crusade*.

⁵ President Pierce, February 11, 1856. See *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, V.

⁶ *Advertiser and State Gazette*, March 1, 1856, from *Eufaula Spirit of the South*.

from South Carolina, fifty were Georgians, one was from Illinois, one from Boston, and the rest were Alabamians. The *Alabama Journal* of this date characterizes the emigrants collected in Montgomery as a superior class of young men, quiet, gentlemanly, temperate. Later some members of the party seem not to have deserved this praise.

On Saturday, April 5, Major Buford formed his men in line in front of the Madison House, and made a speech to them urging that they abstain from intoxicating liquors, and conduct themselves as gentlemen and good citizens. They were then marched to the Agricultural Fair Grounds and organized into a battalion of four companies under temporary officers, and Buford was elected *General* of the force. Saturday night a meeting of the citizens of Montgomery was held in Estelle Hall, and addresses were made by prominent gentlemen. Major Buford explained that he had undertaken this mission in order to settle Kansas with good and true Southern men who would uphold the right of their native land in the new country which was to be their future home. He was followed by other prominent speakers who declared that the fate of the South depended on the success or failure of the efforts now being made to save the new territory for the South. Resolutions were passed thanking the men who had so nobly responded to the call upon them for the defence of Southern rights against Northern aggression.

The battalion attended divine service on Sunday at the Baptist church. After the sermon the pastor, Rev. I. T. Tichenor, proposed that since some ministers at the North had been raising money to equip emigrants with Sharp's rifles, they present each man of Buford's battalion with a more powerful weapon—the Bible. The necessary amount was subscribed at once; it being found that there was not a sufficient number of Bibles in Montgomery, the money was turned over to Major Buford, who was to purchase them at some point on his route.

The next day the emigrants were marched again to the Baptist church where Rev. Mr. Tichenor on behalf of his congregation presented a handsome Bible to Major Buford, a song written by a lady of Montgomery was sung by the crusaders, and then the Rev. Mr. Dorman of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, offered up a prayer asking the blessings of heaven for Buford and his men.¹ It was noticed that the battalion carried two banners with inscrip-

¹ Full accounts of the stay of the Buford party in Montgomery will be found in the Montgomery papers, April 4-9, 1856. See also Joseph Hodgson's *Cradle of the Confederacy*.

tions on them. One had in large letters upon it: "*The Supremacy of the White Race*," and on the reverse side was: "*Kansas, The Outpost*." The second banner had the simple legend: "*Kansas*." The Montgomery company wore silk badges with the inscription: "*Alabama for Kansas—North of 36° 30'. Bibles—not Rifles*." From the church the battalion marched to the wharf and after speeches from Alpheus Baker and Henry W. Hilliard the emigrants boarded the steamer *Messenger* and departed for Mobile, followed by the cheers of five thousand people and the booming of cannon.

A stop of two days was made in Mobile and an election of officers was held. In Montgomery the party had been divided into four companies and Buford made General. The officers elected now were: B. F. Treadwell, Colonel; Major L. F. Johnston, Quartermaster-General; Captain E. R. Bell (of S. C.), Adjutant-General; John W. Jones (Auburn, Ala.), Surgeon; Gordon, Brown, Andrews, Jernigan (of Ga.), Captains.¹ On April 11, the command was marched to the bookstore of the Messrs. McIlvaine, where each man was supplied with a Bible, and then to the wharf to embark on the steamer *Florida* for New Orleans. At New Orleans a few additional emigrants were picked up and the battalion was divided for making the trip up the Mississippi in the steamers *America* and *Oceana*.

St. Louis was reached on April 23 and a stop was made for one day.² The people of St. Louis rated Buford's enterprise very highly, and regarded him as the best friend of Kansas in the whole South.³ As the party was leaving St. Louis on the steamer *Keystone* for Kansas City, a thief broke into a trunk belonging to Major Buford and stole from it \$5,000. It was believed that one of the emigrants was the thief, but the money was not recovered.⁴ The next stop was made at Westport, where the men were equipped for settlement in Kansas, and on May 2 they passed over the line and scattered about the country seeking desirable locations for homesteads.

The arrival of Buford with settlers from the South greatly encouraged the pro-slavery leaders and alarmed the free-state men.

¹ *Mobile Register*. Also letters from members of the party to the Montgomery papers.

² While at St. Louis Buford addressed a communication to Col. Wm. Walker, provisional governor of "Kansas Territory," an organization attempted by Wyandotte Indians previous to the white settlement, asking permission to settle a portion of his men, who should be carefully selected from the party, on the Wyandotte Reservation. The writer has a certified copy of this letter made by G. W. Martin, Secretary of the Kansas Historical Society.

³ Letter from A. B., Jr., dated St. Louis, April 23, 1856, to the *Advertiser and State Gazette*.

⁴ *St. Louis Herald*, April 26, 1856.

"Our hearts have been made glad," wrote one of the Southerners, "by the late arrival of large companies from South Carolina and Alabama. They have responded nobly to our call for help. The noble Buford is already endeared to our hearts; we love him; we will fight for him and die for him and his noble companions."¹ On the free-state side, ex-Governor Reeder writes in his diary: "There have come to the territory this spring three or four hundred young men, including Buford's party, who evidently came here to fight, and whose leaders probably understood the whole program before they left home." Before the party left Westport there was a meeting of the citizens to make the presentation to Major Buford of a fine horse, with fine saddle and bridle.² Nearly half a century later an old citizen of Westport writes: "The people of Westport were glad to see Buford's men come. They were doubly glad when they went away finally."

By May 7 the colonists had scattered over different portions of the territory with the intention of locating permanently as citizens, and Buford was seeking some central location for himself in order that he might maintain communication with the members of his colony.³ Blue Jacket on the Wakarusa was suggested to him as a desirable place in which to settle.

The emigrants had not yet settled permanently, or at least few of them had done so, but were seeking favorable locations for claims on the government lands before pre-empting their quarter-sections. Most of them were destined never to make their homes in Kansas, for at the very time when they came over the border there was trouble again between the territorial government and the free-state settlers at Lawrence. Indictments had been found by the Douglas County grand jury against a number of free-state men living at Lawrence, and the United States marshal feared to undertake their arrest without a strong posse. So on May 11 he summoned the citizens of Kansas to appear in Leecompton in force sufficient to execute the laws.

In response to this call for men, Buford gathered his colonists, some of them at Leecompton, but the greater part of them at Franklin, where they were enrolled and armed by Governor Shannon as territorial militia.⁴ Buford's force at Franklin numbered four hun-

¹ Manager of Lafayette County Emigration Society.

² *Border Times* (Westport), May 3, 1856.

³ Letter from J. M. Thompson, Liberty, Missouri, to General Strickler, of Kansas (copy in possession of writer).

⁴ Letter to *Alabama Journal* of May 31, from a former printer on that paper (Wilson?). Also Mrs. S. T. L. Robinson's *Kansas: Its Interior and Exterior Life*; J. F. Rhodes, *United States*.

dred men, and was under the direction of United States Marshal I. B. Donelson.

Captain E. R. Bell of South Carolina, one of Buford's officers (Adjutant-General), was sent with a company of men to intercept arms and armed men and prevent them from getting into Lawrence, which was preparing to withstand a siege. May 16, he captured a wagon loaded with guns and sabres. Three days later he was notified that three wagons loaded with arms would attempt to cross a bridge near where he was stationed. Taking volunteers from the companies at Franklin, Bell went with thirty-six foot-soldiers and five mounted men to catch the wagons. The mounted men reached the bridge first and drove off a sentinel party of free-state men stationed there. These men warned the drivers of the wagons and they escaped. Shortly after the mounted men reached the bridge a free-state man came up and attempted to cross. He was halted "by order of the United States Marshal." "I do not recognize that authority," he said, and tried to force his way across, presenting a pistol at the guards. He was "halted" three times and was then fired upon and wounded.¹ The next day ten of Buford's men carried G. W. Brown, editor of the *Herald of Freedom*, as a federal prisoner to Lecompton. Two of these men on their return to Franklin were fired upon by a party of free-state men and one of the Southerners was shot through the arm. The other Southerner killed the man who had shot his comrade, and then, followed by a volley, assisted the wounded man to escape.

On May 20, the marshal began gathering his forces, to assemble before Lawrence. On the morning of May 21, early risers in Lawrence were astonished to see a force of soldiery drawn up on Mount Oread, a high hill near the town. Buford did not arrive until eleven o'clock. His men carried the banners that had been brought from Alabama. These banners seem to have offended some good citizens of Lawrence worse than the sack of the town and the destruction of property. The force investing Lawrence was Kansas territorial militia under the command of United States Marshal I. B. Donelson and Deputy-Marshal Fain. The latter with a small party entered the town and made several arrests, meeting with no resistance. He then returned to the militia assembled outside of the town and declared the posse disbanded. Samuel J. Jones, Sheriff of Douglas county, immediately summoned the entire body to assist him in serving some writs.

The Free State Hotel in Lawrence had been used during the Wakarusa War as a place of armed rendezvous, and each of the

¹ Letter from Captain Bell dated Franklin, May 20, to *Charleston Courier*, copied in *Alabama Journal*, June, 1856.

newspapers had published articles of an inflammatory and seditious nature denying the legality of the territorial government. Consequently the grand jury of Douglas County had declared them "nuisances," and as such had recommended their abatement.¹ To "abate" them was the intention of Sheriff Jones. He marched his posse to the foot of the hill and formed a hollow square. Ex-Senator Atchison and others addressed the party, declaring their intention to destroy the hotel and the two printing-presses. Major Buford and many others of the sheriff's posse protested against this outrage, and endeavored to dissuade the sheriff from carrying out his designs. In a "Memorial to the President from the Inhabitants of Kansas" dated May 22, the prominent citizens of Lawrence state that "Col. Buford of Alabama also disclaimed having come to Kansas to destroy property, and condemned the course which had been taken;" that he used his influence to restrain the sheriff, and expressed his disapproval of the outrage in the strongest terms.²

After the destruction of Lawrence the Alabamians again separated, some going back to Lecompton with Buford; others camped on Bull Creek near Paola, not far from the scene of the John Brown murders, and a third party camped near Dutch Henry's Crossing, where they were visited by John Brown, who passed for a federal surveyor. He mingled with the men, heard their plans to catch him, and made his arrangements accordingly.

Civil war broke out in Kansas after the murder of the pro-slavery settlers by John Brown. Col. Sumner in command of United States troops took the field and dispersed or drove out of Kansas all armed bodies of men. All of Buford's men who were in arms were forced to go back into Missouri, most of them returning to Westport. At this time Buford bought twenty-five horses for the use of his men at Westport. These horses were used in their trips to Kansas afterward, and became well known as "Buford's Cavalry."³

The events leading up to and following the raid on Lawrence and the murders by John Brown had greatly demoralized the Buford settlers. Unable on account of the hostility of the anti-slavery party to make homes for themselves in Kansas, they were

¹ J. N. Holloway's *History of Kansas*.

² The full text of the Memorial is given in Charles Robinson's *Kansas Conflict*.

³ Letter to *Alabama Journal* of July 2, dated Westport, June 15, from Wilson, a former printer on that paper. He writes: "Very nearly the last man of us is flat broke. Impossible to get work in the territory. Clothes are giving out, and some of the boys are returning home. Some are going to stay and see it out. Major Buford is preparing a statement of expenditures to show to the South. He has spent his fortune on this enterprise and will not have a cent left for his children. However, he relies on the sympathy of friends at home to assist him out, and take care of us poor devils until the question is settled and Kansas becomes a State."

forced to live on the country by contributions made by sympathizers with their cause or forced from their enemies. On the night of June 4 a number of Alabamians at Franklin were attacked by a free-state company, who broke into the stores Buford had provided for the settlers and carried away provisions, arms, ammunition, etc. Four of Buford's men were wounded in this fight. Two of the Montgomery company (Powell and Vickers) with three Georgians were sent by Buford for a wagon and returning were captured by the free-state men, robbed of their arms, and tortured several hours before being released.¹

The first week in June a large part of Buford's men accompanied General Whitfield into Kansas to protect pro-slavery settlers who were being driven from their homes. The governor however ordered all armed parties to disband, and Col. Sumner again sent the Alabamians back to Missouri. On this expedition into Kansas Captain Jernigan was captured by free-state guerrillas, but was released by United States troops.

Buford himself spent the first part of June in Westport and Kansas City consulting with the pro-slavery leaders, and endeavoring to devise some plan to support the failing cause of the South in Kansas. Alpheus Baker and Major L. F. Johnston had returned to Alabama soon after reaching the territory, for more men and more money. Now, on June 21, Buford and others sent an appeal to the South for more emigrants to check the abolitionists in their efforts to drive the pro-slavery party from Kansas.²

June 26, Buford left the territory on a mission to the South in the interest of Kansas. He visited Washington and the principal cities of the slave states. In Washington he remained several weeks endeavoring to interest the Southern leaders in his scheme for the colonization of Kansas. Robert Toombs, R. M. T. Hunter, J. B. DeBow and other prominent Southerners gave him valuable aid in forwarding his projects.³ After an absence of several months spent in trying to arouse the South to a sense of her danger, Buford returned to Kansas late in 1856.

Meanwhile all had not gone well with the colonists he had left behind. Numbers had returned to Alabama after the first troubles in the territory in May. A state of civil war existed for months after the Brown murders and the raid upon Lawrence. The pro-slavery settlers lived in constant fear for their lives. Under such

¹ Letter to *Advertiser and State Gazette*, from W. W. Cook, Westport, June 3.

² *Alabama Journal*. Letter from J. M. Buford of Portland, Oregon, a brother of Major Buford. Professor Spring's *Kansas*.

³ Letters belonging to Major Buford's daughter. Copies in possession of writer.

unfavorable conditions the Buford party disbanded. A good number enlisted in the United States troops stationed in Kansas, some of them went over to the other side and became free-state partisans,¹ others made their way south again, while one party remained during the fall at Westport. They were encamped near the home of Col. McGee, an ardent states-rights man, who, however, reports himself as having suffered much from disorderly pro-slavery friends.

In December Buford was at Westport and made preparations to return to Alabama in the spring. He published an account of the receipts and expenditures of his expedition in the *Westport Star of Empire*. The figures were as follows :

Cost of enterprise.....	\$24,625.06
Contributions	13,967.90
Leaving a loss of.....	\$10,657.16

These figures show the expenditures and losses of the Buford enterprise only. None of the expenses of the Clayton and other colonies or his own expenses and losses from theft are reckoned in this account. The loss was borne by Major Buford.

January 12, 1857, Buford with others signed an address to the South in behalf of the National Democratic Party of Kansas. This is the last appearance he makes in the affairs of the territory.

More clearly than any other man Buford had foreseen the results that must follow the admission of Kansas as a free state. He gave his fortune to the cause, and worked long and faithfully to arouse the South to the impending danger, but his prophetic voice was not fully heeded. His colonization plan was a failure financially and politically. The institutions of the South could not be transplanted to Kansas. The question that he hoped to have settled by votes in Kansas was finally decided by bayonets on a hundred bloody battle-fields in the South.²

WALTER L. FLEMING.

¹ J. M. Buford ; Von Holst.

² After his return from Kansas Buford lived at Clayton, Alabama, where on August 28, 1861, he died suddenly of heart disease. "At the time of his death not one scrap of the history of the expedition, of the number of men enlisted in it, or their names, places of residence, or anything pertaining to it could be found. He had deposited them all in some bank or other place of security in Washington City of which he told no one. No trace of his papers could be found after his death. He was a very secretive man, and seldom informed any one of his plans or purposes."—J. M. Buford.

THE GUIANA BOUNDARY

A POSTSCRIPT TO THE WORK OF THE AMERICAN COMMISSION

My theme is not the award. All that America or Americans asked was arbitration, and arbitration there has been. Venezuela herself, our client, even had she not been awarded that for which she most hotly strove—the mouth of her great river—could as the weaker power find ample cause for gratitude in any boundary which has such guaranty of permanence.

But, now that the episode has safely passed from politics to history, it seems to me due to those whose interest in the history of Guiana outlives the dispute as to ownership, and who may still treasure the work done for President Cleveland's Commission as a lasting gain to our knowledge of the exploration and settlement of the western world, that some effort should be made to check its results by the new evidence laid before the final tribunal. I trust it is not presumption for me to undertake the task; and certainly in no pages could it find so fitting place as in those of the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*.

The labors of the American Commission, it will be remembered, were cut short in the midst, early in 1897, by the treaty of arbitration between Great Britain and Venezuela. Some months before, indeed—as early as November 10, 1896—the treaty was so nearly assured that Secretary Olney could request the Commission to suspend its deliberations; and it can now be no breach of confidence to add that for weeks prior to this the shadow of the coming event had narrowed the field of research. Thus, much was left undone. There could be no such sifting and testing of Spanish claims as of Dutch. The history of present-century Guiana was scarcely entered on. And, even in the field explored, more than one tempting avenue of inquiry was left unentered.

To these tasks the advocates of Great Britain and of Venezuela could now address themselves. Their time, it is true, was but scant. By the terms of the treaty “the printed Case of each of the two Parties, accompanied by the documents, the official correspondence, and other evidence on which each relies” must be in the hands of the other party and of the judges within, at farthest, nine

months from the exchange of the ratifications. But the ratifications were not finally exchanged until mid-June; and, though a whole half-year more had gone before Great Britain announced as her counsel Sir Richard Webster, Mr. Asquith, and Mr. Rowlatt, and before Venezuela retained Mr. Mallet-Prevost, General Harrison, and General Tracy, and yet many months more ere there was added to the British side Sir Robert Reid and to the Venezuelan Mr. James Russell Soley, scholars were from the first at work under the direction of the two governments. Nor were the counsel strangers to the question at issue. Sir Richard, at least, as Attorney-General of Great Britain, must long have known it well; and of yet longer standing or deeper study were Mr. Harrison's relations with it as President of the United States, Mr. Tracy's as a member of his Cabinet, and Mr. Mallet-Prevost's as the Secretary of President Cleveland's Commission.

It was not strange, then, that even the Case of each country, submitted in mid-March of 1898, was able to include in the huge mass of appended evidence a considerable number of fresh documents. Much bulkier and more important was the new evidence published by the Counter-Case which each filed with the other five months later, on the 15th of August. And not less interesting than these new documents were the fresh maps embodied in the handsome atlases with which each state accompanied both Case and Counter-Case. So ended the gathering of evidence. The printed argument next prepared by each party and submitted on December 15 could only interpret and discuss, not enlarge, the testimony already presented. The same restriction governed, of course, the oral argument, which in almost interminable detail dragged on at Paris before the arbiters from June to October of 1899; yet, even at this late stage, by joint consent, more than one item of new testimony was laid before the judges.

Multiple and various were the fresh sources of this fresh evidence. Most fruitful to the British side were perhaps the Hydrographic Depository at Madrid, the colonial archives of British Guiana (where less than had been supposed proved to have fallen a prey to tropical destroyers), and the records of the old Walcheren town of Veere. To the Venezuelans the archives of the old Spanish-American realms, reinforced afresh by those of Spain and of the Capuchin order at Rome, yielded most of value.

But alas for any who shall seek to study these new documents by themselves! Scattered in their chronological order through the vastly greater mass of reprinted ones, they are, save to the most wearisome search, as effectively lost in the thousand pages of Vene-

zuela's evidence and the nearly two thousand of Great Britain's as—well, as those who wished the judges uninfluenced by earlier conclusions could prefer them to be.

That it is not my purpose to discuss anew the whole of this evidence or the arguments by which it was made to serve the interests of either party I need not say. I have read it all afresh and for its re-weighing have skipped no page of case or argument, not even of the four or five thousand printed pages in which the French compositor has done what he could to make unintelligible the pleas before the judges at Paris ; but while leaving uncorrected no palpable slip brought to light in the work done for the American Commission, my aim is rather to point out, without debate, the content of the evidence newly found and the light it seems to throw on the doings and relations of Spaniards and Dutch in Guiana. I cannot bring myself to turn from this study without the passing remark that no American has cause for aught but pride, at least as regards historical knowledge and insight, in the part played by his countrymen, whether as counsel or as judges, in the great lawsuit.

I shall the better reach my aim if my treatment frankly follows that of the American report. Let me, then, deal first with the earliest relations of Spanish and Dutch in Guiana, next with the adjustment of these at the peace of Westphalia, and with the rights and claims of the Dutch West India Company, then with the successive advances by the Dutch into the Essequibo and its neighbor rivers of western Guiana and with their claims in this quarter, and finally with the counter-advances and the rival claims of the Spaniards.

As to the period prior to the last decade of the sixteenth century no fresh evidence was offered either by Great Britain or by Venezuela. Both countries frankly relinquished all assertion of European settlement in Guiana before this date. The Venezuelans still urged with vigor the Spanish discovery and exploration of these coasts, and their British opponents, in belittling these, were able to point out a serious slip in the work of the American experts ;¹

¹ It was, I am happy to add, the *only* such slip they pointed out, and they cleverly made the most of it. The error was a mistaken reading (American Commission's Report, III. 175, 189, 190) of a manuscript note on an old Spanish map of Guiana. The note tells of a certain Arawak cacique, who in the year 1553 went up the Essequibo and descended on the other slope to the Amazon. The blunder lay in failing to notice that the mention of the cacique belonged to the note, and the consequent conjectural ascription of the exploit to "some unnamed explorer—presumably the Spaniard whose explorations the map is meant to illustrate." What made the slip easy was that the map bears elsewhere, in several places, names of Indian caciques ; that the "Año 1553" which in this case follows is preceded by a period (after the fashion of the sixteenth century) ; and that a couple of near-by notes begin likewise with a date. But the blunder was

but neither longer questioned that European settlement in Guiana began with Berrio's town of Santo Thomé on the Orinoco. It is indeed the explicit assertion of the earliest of the new documents submitted by Great Britain—an exceedingly interesting letter of January 1, 1593, from Don Antonio Berrio himself to the King of Spain, wherein he reports his "ten years spent in continual labors" to penetrate to El Dorado—that "from the mouth of the river Amazon to that of the Orinoco the map shows more than four hundred leagues," and that "in all this breadth and more than fifteen hundred leagues in depth there is not a spot peopled by Spaniards." This letter of Berrio and two later ones printed with it make it impossible longer to credit Fray Pedro Simon's date of 1591 or 1592 for the founding of Santo Thomé, and, when added to Raleigh's silence¹ and to the letters of Felipe de Santiago and of Roque de Montes earlier produced by England, leave small ground for believing that the town can have come into existence (save perhaps as an Indian village harboring Spanish guests) earlier than the very end of 1595.² As we know indubitably from Keymis that in April, 1596, it was a "rancheria of some twentie or thirty houses," it can hardly be placed later; and Berrio's letters make it all the clearer that from 1592 on such an occupation of Guiana had been contemplated and in preparation.

At last, too, we are given the text of that letter of Berrio's lieutenant, Domingo de Ybarguen y Vera, of October 27, 1597, which served as the basis of such wild statements in the British Blue-Books. The Dutchmen seized by him prove to be only "five Flemings, . . . found on land, belonging to a Flemish ship which had come to traffic at Margarita and Cumaná, and in this island" (Trinidad); and of the Essequibo he says only "I then went to the river Essequibo, where I had much information as to the people grave, and I blush for it. Let me only plead in defense that the map, which fell into my hands just at the close of my work in Washington, was mentioned at all only to dismiss it as having "no direct bearing on the question of boundary." The further British claim that "the map cannot be earlier than the seventeenth century because it shows two Spanish towns in Trinidad" I cannot for a moment accede to. It shows no towns in Trinidad. One of the marks thus interpreted is only the ? of Trinidad ? (*i. e.*, Trinidad)—a spelling common among the early explorers, *cf.* Raleigh, Keymis, Wyatt), and the other but a fleck (such as abound on the map) which happens to be near the Spanish word *palmar*, a palm-grove. The handwriting and the orthography, as well as the substance of the notes, show it clearly of the middle of the sixteenth century.

¹To which should perhaps be added that of Robert Dudley, who sent a boat up the Orinoco in February, 1595, and whose own narrative is now supplemented by the more detailed one of his captain, Wyatt (first published last year by the Hakluyt Society). Yet it is unlikely that Dudley's boat went so far up as the site of Santo Thomé.

²This date receives a slight further support from another letter produced by England, written to the King of Spain in 1609 by one of Domingo de Vera's twenty-two hundred colonists.

wearing clothes and using the same arms in fighting as the people of New Granada"—a passage no longer suggestive of "white men."

But, while Great Britain thus gave over all assertion of Dutch settlement in Guiana prior to 1613, she still stoutly fought the claim that Spain had ever occupied the Essequibo. She even brought bodily to the arbiters the carved keystone of the old fort at Kijk-overal, sometimes thought the work of Portuguese or Spaniards, to show that the emblem on it is not a cross, and offered much expert testimony to prove the architecture Dutch—a conclusion else most probable. To the other evidence for the presence of Spaniards, however, she could oppose only the silence of Spanish records; and this the Venezuelans were able to meet with a fresh paper of much interest—a letter of the Duke of Lerma, who writing on behalf of the King of Spain, February 2, 1615, to the president of the Spanish Council of the Indies, mentions, among the places against which the Dutch were rumored to be planning an attack, Essequibo, "where there are some persons, from twelve to fifteen Spaniards, who there till the soil to raise cassava root, from which bread is made for the Governor of Trinidad and Orinoco."

But not only did both sides agree in accepting for the beginning of Dutch trade on the Guiana coast the year 1598, and for the beginning of Dutch attempts at settlement there the year 1613, there was a unanimity substantially as great as to the first establishment of the Dutch in the Essequibo. If the British lawyers did not explicitly relinquish Major John Scott's tradition of its settlement by "one Captain Gromwegle" in 1616, they admitted its uncertainty, and were content with insisting that "an organized colony under the West India Company was in existence on that river" soon after the creation of the Company in 1621. In support of this they produced, from the manuscripts of the British Museum, the journal of certain "Heads of Families sent by the Directors of the West India Company to visit the Coast of Guiana" in 1623. This journal, written in French (the families seem to have been Huguenots), tells us that "the Directors of the West India Company had resolved at entering on their administration to send to the river Amazon and coast of Guiana," and were begged by one Jesse Des Forests, "who, with the permission of the States-General of the United Provinces, had enrolled several families desirous of inhabiting the said Indies," that these "might be employed in the service of the said Company." But "the said Directors thought that, instead of transporting the said families, it would be better to send a certain number of heads of families, in order . . . to see the places and to choose

themselves the place of their dwelling." These deputies sailed, accordingly, on July 1, 1623, in the ship *Pigeon* of 100 tons, "to make the voyage to the Amazon." Reaching that river on October 20, they pushed northwestward along the coast, prospecting as they went, as far as the Wiapoco, where they arrived in December. There they selected a place for their colony, and there they were left by their ship, which returned to Holland on the first day of 1624. In the following summer (so, at least, one must infer from the scanty extracts, which, alas, are all that is printed of this precious document), a flotilla having meanwhile arrived from Holland, they pressed on westward with their prospecting and on August 15, 1624, reached the Demerara. Thence, on the 16th, they write, "our sloop went to Ezikebe [Essequibo] to carry our master on board the Admiral to learn his wishes;" and, on the 22d, "our sloop having returned, our ship went to Ezikebe to fetch the remainder of the merchandise which the Admiral had left there." There they tarried till the 28th, when they returned to the Demerara, and, having first transferred the Admiral into a ship which was to return home, they sailed on September 9 for the Carribean Islands. In this description of the Essequibo, which shows that they ascended the river as far as the confluence of Cuyuni and Mazaruni, they remark that "the Spaniards of San Thomé" (so the British editors acutely translate the "Saint Omer" of the French text) "formerly traded there, but now they dare not go there," and their journal later quotes "a Frenchman who lived there three years," and who had been "above the second fall of the river, where there was a crystal mine;" but there is no mention of any previous Dutch occupation, nor is there anything to imply that the expedition here described had other aim or result than exploration and trade. Yet it is at least not improbable that a Dutch outlier may have remained in the river from this time forward; and the difference between this date of August, 1624, and that of 1625, reached by the Americans and accepted by the Venezuelans, is insignificant. It is a thousand pities that this journal, which so happily helps replace a lost record-book of the West India Company, could not be published in full.

On the vicissitudes of the trading-post in the Essequibo prior to the end of the long war with Spain no further light has been thrown. As to the hostile activity of Dutch fleets and privateers in the Orinoco and its creeks Great Britain was able, however, to produce from Spanish archives testimony of moment: (1) a report of the Spanish governor, the Marquis of Sofraga, who, writing from Bogotá in July, 1631, avers that, after the sacking of Santo

Thomé by the Dutch in 1629, "other squadrons of corsairs came and settled and fortified themselves in the arms and creeks of the river Orinoco" as well as in the island of Tobago, and that "information has been received that the same or another squadron was coming this year to take possession of the city and of a quicksilver mine which is said to have been discovered close to it on the bank of the said river Orinoco;" (2) a memorandum by Don Juan Desologuren, dated in November 1637 at the same Spanish-American capital, wherein, relating the expulsion of the Dutch from Tobago by the Spaniards in 1636 and their taking refuge in the Essequibo and the Berbice, he asserts that "on the river Orinoco itself, and on its most important mouth, in the same part of the mainland as the settlement of Santo Thomé de la Guayana, at thirty leagues' distance from it, there were ten Dutch waiting for reinforcements to fortify themselves from the year 1636;" (3) some eight or ten documents of the Spaniards of Orinoco in 1637 and 1638, whose testimony goes to support that already published as to the presence of Dutchmen in the Amacura immediately before and after the renewed Dutch sack of Santo Thomé in 1637. Just what faith, in the absence of all confirmation from Dutch sources, these Spanish rumors deserve, it is not easy to know; but it can no longer be doubted that they have a basis of fact.¹ That there was on the part of the Dutch West India Company, however, any thought of settlement here, is, in view of the silence of its records, hardly to be believed; and side by side with the documents just described is produced a letter written to the King of Spain in 1634 by the Bishop of Porto Rico, who, making now his first pastoral visitation in Guiana (which seven years before had been transferred to his diocese), reports the interesting news that Santo Thomé "had been removed, for rather more than a year, six leagues distant from where it used to be, in order to occupy a more concealed position on the river Orinoco, and one not so unhealthy, beside which the place is better defended against the Dutch," and who urges especially upon His Majesty the necessity of better protecting his colony from these foes, yet expressly names as the nearest post of the Dutch that on the Essequibo.

No fresh evidence has thrown new light upon the purpose or the interpretation of the disputed clauses of the Treaty of Münster. The British advocates persist in seeing in them an express admission of a right of the Dutch to all conquests they could make in America; while their opponents, going to the opposite extreme, would make them an express grant to the Dutch of what they had

¹ The suspicion uttered in the American Commission's report (I. 294), that they may rest on an error, must therefore be withdrawn.

already seized or could conquer from the Portuguese alone, and hence, by implication, prohibition of all else. In support of their contention the Venezuelans were indeed able to produce a plea of the West India Company in its controversy with the English over New Netherland a dozen years later (November 5, 1660) which averred that "the King of Spain, first discoverer and founder of this new American world," had "at the conclusion of the peace made over to the United Netherland Provinces all his right and title to such countries and domains as by them in course of time had been conquered in Europe, America, etc.;" and the Britons on their side could point, not only to the contemporary report of the French envoys at Münster (that, while "the King of Spain consents to be debarred from extending his boundaries in the East Indies," and to limit them to what he now occupies there, he agrees that "the conquests which may be made by the United Provinces either over the natives of the country or over the Portuguese shall remain theirs"), but also to the verdict of the later Dutch statesman Basnage that "this article was advantageous to the Republic because Spain bound her hands and undertook not to make any new conquests in the East, while the Dutch retained the power to extend their limits far and wide in America, and particularly in Brazil." Yet, despite these dicta, and the clever arguments based upon them, I cannot believe that to any historian who has breathed the air of the seventeenth century they will carry conviction. As we know from their own lips, the Dutch, who drew the treaty, had no mind that Spain, in such a document, should assume either to permit or to forbid their conquest of territory hers only by claim. The treaty left them free by its silence, it did not make them so by its stipulations; and no more than this, surely, can have been meant by Basnage¹ or the French envoys. As for the quoted words of the West India Company, they were a desperate special plea to meet an English claim of prior settlement, and were blushed for as soon as uttered; for in the very next paragraph their authors protest that they deem "such claim and forced argument" unnecessary.² Of the rights and claims of the Dutch West India Company, indeed, nothing really new was learned by either side, and the sweeping statements of the British Blue-Books were now abandoned or greatly modified.³

¹ Had I not held this view of Basnage's meaning and looked on it as self-evident, I should be more chagrined by my omission of these words of his from my report to the American Commission than by anything else these later researches have suggested.

² Brodhead, *Documents relative to the Colonial History of New York*, II. 139.

³ That so misleading a statement as that "the Wild Coast was the original name of the coast between the Orinoco and the Essequibo" (where, of course, for Essequibo should be read Amazon) could be retained in a footnote to the British evidence was, I am convinced, only an oversight: no attempt was made, in the argument, to use or to defend it.

More fortunate was the inquiry into the doings of the Dutch on the Essequibo. Upon the earliest history of that settlement, it is true, no fresh light was thrown, unless one take seriously the Spanish rumor¹ that a part of the Dutch colonists expelled from Tobago in 1636 "finally settled on the river Essequibo, a hundred leagues off, a hundred and twenty in number with many negroes"—a rumor which, however unreliable in itself and discredited by the silence of Dutch records, gains a touch of plausibility from the "sap of sugar cane" sent home by the Essequibo commander in the following spring, but which, even if credible, loses all significance through the known return to Holland of the Essequibo colonists in the summer of 1637. On the character and activities of the colony just at the end of the seventeenth century, however, a flood of knowledge is brought us by the discovery and the publication in full of an official diary of its administration covering the two years from July 1, 1699, to June 14, 1701—a document filling more than a hundred printed pages. Yet this gossipy journal's yield for the history of the colony's civilization is much greater than for that of its boundaries. As to the whereabouts of these it tells us nothing; but nowhere had we so vivid a picture of the part played in the life of the colony by its outrunners and postholders. From it we first learn of the existence somewhere above the rapids in the Cuyuni of a dye-store (*i. e.*, a station for the bartering-in of annatto from the Indians) such as we already knew to have existed somewhere on the Mazaruni.

To our knowledge of Dutch doings in the Pomeroon and the Moruca the new research was of especial profit. In the neglected archives of the old Dutch town of Veere the British searchers found a body of papers which nearly or quite doubles our knowledge of the Guiana colony planted in 1658 by the Walcheren cities. Especially is this true as regards its obscure later years. From a long letter written in March of 1663 by the then Commandeur in the Pomeroon, J. De Fijn, we learn not only of the thrift and importance of the colonists settled on the Moruca, but furthermore of the maintenance in that river of a fort, known as the *Huis Nassau*. The prosperity of this colony is confirmed by fresh Spanish testimony. Writing from Santo Thomé in March, 1662, to the King of Spain, Don Pedro de Viedma reports that "he had sent a person to reconnoitre the settlements," and that "there are two foundations, one of 150 Dutch and another of 280, and to these are added 200 wealthy Indians, of those expelled from Brazil, and that in the two settlements they have introduced 1500 negro slaves for their

¹ In Don Juan Desologuren's memorandum of November 19, 1637, mentioned above.

plantations ; and that besides these there is the fort of Essequibo, which has been founded more than thirty years, and that "the person who was sent to reconnoitre was told by the Dutch that they were expecting more people for the purpose of completing the settlement of those rivers, and two shiploads of negroes." And in a later letter of the same month he is able to state that the Dutch in the Pomeroon and the Moruca now number "more than a thousand men, with four hundred Indians and a greater number of negroes, founding a new Brazil." Similar in purport are the sworn statements of one Clement Gunter, a member of the Dutch colony, who in 1655, on a trading expedition into the Orinoco, was arrested and imprisoned by the Spanish authorities.

Of the history of the second Dutch colony in Pomeroon and Moruca (1686-1689) nothing new is told us ; nor is our knowledge of the later Dutch occupancy of those rivers materially increased by the later researches. The British searchers seem even to have overlooked or underrated a land-grant of whose existence I have knowledge through another channel and which it can now be no breach of faith to publish for the behoof of history—it is the grant to Frederic Beissenteufel, on January 6, 1760, of a thousand acres on the west side of the Moruca at its mouth.¹ Of the existence of this plantation we had known, and that it was at the mouth of the river, but not on which side ; and the grant is interesting, not alone as our one proof of Dutch settlement west of that river, but because it fixes as well the site of the Dutch lookout established here in 1757 and of the fortified post maintained on the same spot from 1784 onward. As we know these to have been on Beissenteufel's land, they too must have been at the west of the Moruca.

But, if British search missed this at home, it unearthed in Spain a precious paper which had eluded the search of the Venezuelans—the lost diary of Inciarte, the young Spanish officer who in 1779 made, as "Commissioner of Settlements on the Eastern Side of the Lower Orinoco," an elaborate reconnoissance of the whole region from Orinoco to Pomeroon, and whose summary report had alone been hitherto known. Interesting especially is his minute description of the Moruca post—"an ordinary house, roofed with thatch and barred with large beams, without mud and wattle," its means of defense consisting of "two four-pounders and sundry swivel-guns, all dismounted." Other evidence of Dutch occupation, whether in the Moruca or the Pomeroon, he seems to have

¹ "Aen Fredrik Bysenteufel syn toegestaen een duysent akkers aen de Westsyde van Moroca van de nieuwe brandwagt de kreek opwaarts, als mede eenige broodgronden, mits de Indiaenen geen hinder doende."

found none save that in the latter river, just above where it receives the Tapacuma creek, he saw "a silk cotton tree, at the side of which," as an Arawak Indian assured him, "in times past a Dutchman from Essequibo had his dwelling and good farms." There, having landed, Inciarte "found almost on the very bank a cocoa plantation of a few huge trees with a multitude of little plants"—probably a survival of the colony of the preceding century. Yet more interesting, perhaps, is the map drawn up at the same time by the young engineer and now first published. It is the most careful one of this region prior to the researches of Schomburgk, and it leaves us no doubt as to the site of the points described by Inciarte. It is amusing to note how even this careful explorer shared the Spanish belief in a *town* of Essequibo—"villa de Esquibo"—which he places on the west shore of the river, opposite Fort Island.

It was already known—though now in more detail—that, on the basis of his reconnoissance, Inciarte recommended to the Spanish authorities the establishment of two fortified settlements, one at the site of the Dutch post on the upper Moruca, the other in the Pomeroon; but the Venezuelans now produce a somewhat startling body of documents showing that this project for the occupation of lower Guiana was never lost from sight by Spain till the very eve of the revolt of the colonies.

As to the Waini and the Barima, Inciarte's diary and map are, of course, not less precious evidence than as to their eastern neighbors. Of the only trace of European occupation he found here—the abandoned plantation of the Dutchman "Mener Nelch"—he speaks no more fully than in the report we had already; but its site, on the Aruka, he describes with more minuteness. More novel and not less interesting is the much earlier testimony of the above-quoted letter of De Fijn, Commandeur of the Dutch in the Pomeroon, as to a seventeenth-century reconnoissance of the Barima. "Having left the river Orinoco," writes the Dutch governor, who is reporting to his principals in Holland a trading trip which at their instance he has just made to Santo Thomé, "and coming by way of the river Barima on January 15, 1663, I resolved to inspect the aforesaid place, in order to see whether it was suitable to dwell in and whether vessels could navigate the river." Accordingly he pushed up the stream some twenty hours as far as a creek (doubtless the Aruka) 16 or 17 Dutch miles, as he thought, from the mouth of the river. Here, "fully half an hour up," he found high land "with fairly good soil and which could well be settled by our people if the population in these regions be-

came so great that all the lands now lying idle were cultivated." It is our earliest tidings of Dutch interest in the Barima. Nor does the new research bring us aught else which adds to our knowledge of Dutch activity in these parts or makes more probable the existence there at any time of a Dutch post or of other settlers than those already known; for the present-day testimony, Indian and official, to the presence along the Barima of signs of old-time cultivation proves nothing as to its date or source.

But to the history of the Barima there comes a contribution from an unexpected quarter. In April of 1899 M. Henri Froidevaux, than whom there is no more eminent student of French colonial history (he has since been called to a lectureship in that subject at the Sorbonne), wrote for the *Revue des Questions Historiques* an admirable review of "the American reports on the Anglo-Venezuelan controversy." It is not merely a review: it supplements. Much more, he states from personal knowledge, might have been learned of the part played in the Barima by the French of the Antilles in the eighteenth century. The errand of Nicolas Gervais, the French Bishop of Oran, on these shores about 1730 was, he intimates, something beyond the conversion of the Indians. He knows of "French designs on this region between 1730 and 1740," mentioning the formation at this date at St. Pierre in Martinique of a private company whose object was to colonize the territories between the Orinoco and the Essequibo and which sent in 1738 an expedition, under one Foucaut du Razet, "to visit these places and there make the inspection necessary for the proposed establishment." This expedition, whose report, he says, may be found in the archives of the French Ministry of the Colonies,¹ coasted the mainland from the Essequibo to the Barima and along the southern mouth of the Orinoco, seeking four Frenchmen who were alleged to have been for seventeen months in that region. The Caribs entered readily into negotiations with them, which are recounted at some length. Foucaut du Razet heard also, in these parts, from a Frenchman who had long lived in the Essequibo, the story that this region had been given to the Elector of Bavaria, who had ceded it to the King of Sweden—only, in this French version, it was not the King of Spain, but "*La France*," that "gave this part of *la France équinoxiale*" to Bavaria. What is more, he can tell us what became of the Swedish enterprise which, a few years earlier, stirred such alarm in Orinoco and Essequibo. "The King of Sweden," he says, "sent thither three years and a half ago² one of his

¹ "Correspondance Générale, C¹⁴, Guyane, Tome XVII. (1737-1740), fol. 339 et s."

² It is not easy to reconcile this date, so exactly given, with the 1732 of which we learn from the Spanish testimony.

vessels to reconnoitre the place and take possession ; but this vessel having perished on the way back to Europe, with all on board, *par le travers de la Bermude*, no Swede has ever again been seen here."

This Swedish legend¹ has been made an object of careful research by an English scholar, too, the Rev. George Edmundson, who devoted to it an interesting article in the *English Historical Review* for January, 1899. For a cession to or by the Elector of Bavaria he can find neither proof nor probability, nor was a Swedish charter or royal commission ever granted for such a Guiana colony ; whence he concludes that the Barima project "was probably a private enterprise, connived at perhaps and indirectly supported by the Swedish government, but without any actual sanction of the authorities." Is it not possible that the Bavarian legend is an outgrowth of the actual Guiana grant in 1669 by the Dutch to the Count of Hanau ? The promoter of this Hanau scheme, the versatile Dr. Becher, had earlier been in relations with the court of Bavaria, and this court is said to have made (about 1665) overtures first to the Dutch West India Company and then to England for the grant of a stretch of the Guiana coast.

As to the Amacura, except the evidence already mentioned for the presence of Dutchmen there in 1730-1740, nothing new has come to light.² Nor, although Dutch haunting and harassing of the Orinoco was yet more abundantly shown, was there found any evidence of attempt at possession in that river.

More fruitful was the research as to the great western branches of the Essequibo. The much vexed question of the Cuyuni posts was set almost at rest by it. Nothing was found, indeed, as to the short-lived, if existent, one of 1703 ; but as to that of 1754-1758 there is now produced from the archives at Madrid³ a letter from the banks of the Caroni written on August 27, 1758, by the Capuchin missionary Father Bispal to the Spanish commandant Iturriaga, which contains this luminous passage : "In the river Cuyuni the

¹ As illustrating the obtrusiveness of this legend it is interesting to note that Inciarte, writing in 1779 from the Dutch post of Moruca to his chief the Spanish Intendant at Caracas, reports that the under-postholder there, "Paul Fernero" (Paulus Vermeere), "said that the former Director-General of Essequibo told him in a letter, that the lands and rivers of Moruca and Guaina [Waini] belonged in ownership to the Dutch, and the creek of Barima and its lands to Sweden." The Director-General meant must be Storm van's Gravesande ; but Vermeere's statement is wholly incredible.

² Something has rather been lost ; for the Spanish mission of Amacuro, mentioned in a footnote of the American Commission's report (I. 297) was on the Paria coast, and the "Amacura" guarded by Indians in 1797 proves but a misreading of Moruca.

³ Hydrographic Depository, Madrid, B, 4a, Viceroyalty of Santa Fe, Vol. II., doc. No. 16.

Dutch continue doing somewhat; last year, 1757, in an island of the said Cuyuni called Tocoropati, two days' journey above the mouth of the said river, they commenced a fortified house on the top of a little hill in the said island, and a cane plantation and a sugar mill in the lower part of the island; and this year the house is already built and fortified, and the mill is grinding the cane from the plantation." This testimony is confirmed and amplified by two letters of the following month (from the same archives), in which the Capuchin prefect, Benito de la Garriga, reports to Iturriaga the Spanish raid on the Dutch post. "Navigating down stream," he writes, "they found an island of much elevation called Tocoropata, where the Post was a short time previously (it was abandoned because it had not sufficient lands for plantations), and on the way they burnt the houses, with those of the ten negroes, in which also lived several postholders; and, after half a day's navigation, they arrived at Aguigua, on the mainland, on this side of Cuyuni, where the Dutch had taken the preliminary steps for establishing the post—the farm cleared and not burned, large, with one or two huts, with the object of at once making a stronghold when they had sufficient provisions—in the meantime maintaining themselves on flour of maize and wheat, spending the articles of barter given them by the Governor for their support." In the face of such evidence the British relinquished their claim that the post was at or near the mouth of the Curumo, and both sides agreed in recognizing the island of Tokoro as the first site of the post. Adequate explanation seeming to both thus found of Schomburgk's Indian tradition of a post in that island, they further concurred in placing the restored post of 1766–1769 not far above that island in the Tonoma rapids where it found its last site. It is not improbable that in this they were right; yet, in view of the explicitness of that tradition, of the absence of evidence for any other site, of the known presence of bread-grounds at the new post, and of the Dutch governor's aggressive purpose, I must still think it possible that the first site of this later post too was at Tokoro. No other Dutch dealings in the upper Cuyuni or Mazaruni were disclosed, save that the dye-collecting, timber-cutting, and food-gathering there was made more vivid by fresh illustration.

On Dutch or Spanish claim to boundary in Guiana no new light was thrown. It was made clearer than ever that the Spaniards counted the Dutch intruders and that the Dutch felt free to encroach on unoccupied lands; but the Dutch remonstrance of 1769 remains the one official communication between the two states suggesting a definite frontier.

As to Spanish occupation and Spanish aggressions, however, the Venezuelans produced fresh evidence of some importance. The existence of the westernmost of the Spanish missions, that of Curumo, was established by the contemporary testimony of the Capuchin prefect, from which we learn the date of its formal dedication, or "founding" (June, 1749), the number and tribe of its Indians (180 Caribs), and the precise duration of its existence (a year and four months), and was confirmed by that of the Spanish governor of the province. Much of detail (which, however, as in the case of the Curumo mission, only strengthened results already reached for the American Commission) was gained, too, as to the identity and activities of these missions in general. Of the remoter Spanish movements in the Wenamu, the Mazaruni, the Siparuni, rumored by a scared Dutch postholder in 1756, nothing more could be learned. The existence and site of the Spanish fortified post on the Cuyuni, they were able, however, to support by added evidence. Regarding no point of fact was the controversy so keen or so stubborn. A page of Governor Marmion's manuscript was photographed in the Spanish archives to demonstrate that the new town which in October, 1793, he reported as having been begun was near the union of the Cuyuni with the Curumo, and not (as it had been unintelligibly transcribed for Great Britain) with the Orinoco;¹ and the original of Schomburgk's great physical map of Guiana had to be produced in court to show his representation of the ruins of this post (on the south of the Cuyuni, a little below its confluence with the Curumo), somehow left out in the British reproduction of the map.

As to Spanish doings in the coast region, I have already spoken of the recovery of the interesting journal of Inciarte's bold reconnaissance in 1779, and of the documents showing the Spanish schemes later based on it. Next to these in interest was perhaps a fragment, of the year 1785, from the diary of Captain Mateo Beltran, the Spanish coast-guard who during that decade was a terror to the Dutch in the region adjoining the Orinoco. But, while these amply illustrate the Spanish aim to control this district, there is in them no mention of the slightest actual settlement there.

Such is what seems to me the most important new evidence brought to light during the course of the arbitral proceedings; and such in brief are the changes which this evidence makes necessary

¹ There fell into my hands in 1898, bought from the Paris bookseller Dufossé (in whose catalogue Professor Jameson, my old colleague of the boundary investigation, espied it and pointed it out to me), what is clearly an earlier draft of this report of Marmion's, corrected and annotated by his own hand. It tells nothing more, but confirms the testimony of the final document. It now belongs to the Cornell University Library.

in the historical conclusions reached for the American Commission. It goes without saying that I have left much undiscussed. The scholar who shall some day write in full the story of Spaniards and of Dutch in South America must sift for himself afresh the whole of the vast unindexed mass. But, till he shall appear, I trust this postscript to the researches of the American Commission may be of some use to the student of this chapter of colonial history.

GEORGE LINCOLN BURR.

DOCUMENTS

Diary of John Harrower, 1773-1776

THAT indented servants were a large class among the emigrants to the American colonies is well known, but it is not to be expected that we should ever obtain a large amount of knowledge of the fortunes of a class so obscure and inarticulate. It is known, also, that of the many Scottish indented servants who came to Virginia before the Revolution, some were employed as schoolmasters. But it was by no means to be expected that we should be able to print, not only the actual diary of an indented servant, but that of one belonging to this peculiarly interesting class. That we are permitted to do so is owing to the kindness of Mrs. Sally Nelson Robins, assistant librarian of the Virginia Historical Society. The document, printed with necessary omission of portions not now interesting, affords most valuable glimpses into the life of an indented servant in America, even though the writer was plainly above the average of that class in intelligence and not all his experiences are typical. The book in which the diary is written is a small quarto volume (about 8 x 6 in.) bound in vellum, and containing at present 145 pages. It once contained a few more. It was found among the papers of the Corbin family, of Moss Neck and Farley Vale, Virginia.

Diligent efforts have been made to discover something of the earlier history of John Harrower, of Lerwick in Shetland. These have been seconded, with the utmost kindness, by James M. Goudie, Esq., of Lerwick, a devoted student of Shetland antiquities, and by Francis J. Grant, Esq., Rothesay Herald, Edinburgh. But little has been found. Mr. Goudie has obligingly sent a series of contributions by him to the *Shetland Times*, embracing extracts from the kirk-session records of Lerwick, and others entitled "Annals of the County of Zetland," edited by another hand. These cast light upon some of the friends mentioned by Harrower, they illustrate the surroundings from which he emigrated, and they to a certain extent exhibit his points of contact with America before he thought of coming here. Thus, on October 15, 1773, only seven weeks before he left his home, a letter from the sheriff substitute is laid before the kirk-session asking charitable aid for the many destitute

passengers of a ship wrecked at Walls, a few miles away, and confined there for a time by reason of the infection among them. It was an emigrant ship. The Rev. Mr. Mill says in his *Diary*¹ concerning it:

“A vessel from Leith with 260 emigrants for North Carolina was by stress of weather put into Vela Sound in Walls. The smallpox at same time carried off severals, and some of their children crammed in the hold were said to be stifled to death and thrown overboard into the sea, before they landed; after which the vessel was driven from her anchors, and so damaged that they could not, for several months, put to sea again. The people were dispersed through the several parishes for subsistence according to the Sheriff’s decret. They went back for Leith in April, and the project for America thereby miscarried.”

But only two direct references to John Harrower have been discovered in Lerwick records. One shows him, as one of the heritors or landholders of the parish, attending a meeting in December, 1765, which votes to send to Scotland for a supply of oatmeal for the poor. The other, January 14 of the same year, is the record of his admission into the Morton Lodge of Freemasons,—“Harrower, John, Merchant, Lerwick.” In records at Edinburgh Mr. Grant finds evidence that he came to Shetland after 1750. He also finds in the Sasine Register, under date of 1762, 1767 and 1770, three evidences of tenements held by “John Harrower merchant in Lerwick and Anna Graham his spouse.” This would seem to have been a previous wife; or the pair may possibly have been our Harrower’s father and mother.

Evidently Harrower was a minor person in Lerwick. Yet he wrote a very good hand, and was fairly well educated at a time when schools hardly existed in Shetland. Whatever may have been the cause of his leaving home (there is no fuller indication than that contained in his letter to his brother-in-law), every page of the diary shows that he was frugal and industrious to a high degree, and he was evidently much regarded by Colonel Daingerfield. Finally, if Jock, his oldest child, was born in November, 1762, he may not improbably have been thirty-five or forty when he left Lerwick. Nothing more is known of his subsequent life than that, after his sojourn at “Belvidera,” he became a sort of manager at “Moss Neck,” near Fredericksburg, the home of Richard Corbin. For this information, and for some of the footnotes, we are indebted to Mrs. Robins.

As to Mrs. Harrower, Mr. Goudie writes:

“His wife belonged to one of the leading families in the town—the Craigies of Stebbiegrind. A portion of the sea-front of the town still

¹ *Diary of the Reverend James Mill* (Scottish History Society, V.), p. 40.

bears their name—'Craigie's Stane.' Miss Turnbull Stewart, a representative of the Craigie family whose residence is the Old Manse, informs me that Mrs. Harrower died in that house. She further says that she remembers coming across an old letter addressed to one of the Craigies, in which the hope was expressed that Mrs. Harrower was being cared for. Nothing is known about Mrs. Harrower's children, but it is evident that she did not join her husband in America."

The old letter referred to may have been that of August 28, 1775, addressed to Captain James Craigie.

DIARY.

Munday, 6th Dec^r 1773. This morning I left my house¹ and family at 4 O'clock in order to travel in search of business and immediately went on board a sloop ready to sail for Leith, Oconachie M^r and at 5 O'clock he sailed Accordingly with the wind at N. At this time I am Master of no more Cash but 8½d and stockings² &c. to the amount of £3 st^r³ or thereabout, a small value indeed to travel with.⁴

Munday, 27th. Wind at S. E. with heavy rain. Both the Smacks in the River yet. This evening it being S^t John's night the Free Masons made a very grand procession through the high street. they began at 6 pm and it was 11 pm before the last loge had done. they were attended by a party of the Grandideers⁵ who carried their flambows and each Loge walked separately, they being three.

Tuesday, 28th. Wind at E. fine weather. this day I once thought of engaging with the M^r of the Elizabeth Brigantine bound for North Carolina but the thoughts of being so far from my family prevented me. at noon the wind came all round to the N. V.⁶ and then Mr. began to make ready as fast as possible for sailing.

Wednesday, 29th. At 2 AM left my Loging having been here 16 days and my method of living was as follows Vizt for Breackfast ½d. worth of bread ½d. worth of Cheese and a bottle of ale at 1d. For dinner ½d. worth of bread, ½d. worth of Broath, 1d. worth of Meat and a bottle of ale at 1d. and the same for supper as for breackfast, and 1d. a night for my bedd. On leaving my logings at the time above mentioned I went onb^d the sloop Williams, Wm. Bell M^r, for Newcastle, and he immediately hauled out of the harbour and made sail with the Wind at N. N. V. At 9 pm was obliged to ly too for the tide on Tynemouth bar. at midnight bore away for the Bar and got weel over it.

Thursday, 30th. At 1 AM we passed by shiels⁷ and went up the River Tyne, and at 2 AM made fast to Newcastle Key, we having been

¹ At Lerwick.

² Shetland stockings were famous, and were already an important article of export.

³ Pounds sterling as distinguished from pounds Scots, the ordinary money of account in Shetland.

⁴ Persuading the master to set him ashore at Montrose, Harrower walked thence to Dundee, where he remained from December 13 to December 29.

⁵ Grenadiers.

⁶ I. e., NW.

⁷ Shields.

no more than 24 hours from Dundee here 3 of which we lay too. At 9 AM I went ashore to Newcastle in Comp^r with M^r Bell and 5 others who were passengers along with me, and after drinking a English poynt of ale a piece I enquired at the Pilots and others if there was any Vessel presently at Newcastle bound for Holland but found there was none. At same time was informed that Sunderland was a more proper place to look out for a ship bound there. . . .

*Munday, 3^d Jan^r, 1774.*¹ This day snowing very hard, Wind at N. N. E. At 9 AM went out to see if I cou'd sell any stockins, but returned again at 10 AM without selling any; I then paid my bedd for two nights which cost me 2d. each night at same time sent out for $\frac{1}{2}$ worth of bread and 1d. worth of cheese for my breakfast and I found both bread and Cheese far less for the money than at Dundee. Yesterday I neither eat nor drank any thing all day but my dinner which cost me $6\frac{1}{2}$ and Just now I am Master of no more Cash than 1s. $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. and when I shall get more God only knows. At 11 AM Crossed the River to South Sunderland and Called to see Wm. Scollay, but was told he was not at home. after that I traviled the Town untill 2 pm in which time I sold three pair of stockins for four shillings and four pence, which was eight pence less than they cost me in Zetland. I then returned home and bought 1d. worth of bread 1d. worth of cheese and 1d. worth of small beer which served me for dinner and supper.

Wednesday, 5th. Wind and weather as yesterday. this afternoon I hear of a Brigantine called the Nancy ready load for Holland, and that she always used that trade.

Thursday, 6th. Wind at S. and a verry gentle thaw. at 8 AM I went to Warmouth² and spacke with Mr. George Lacen [?] Com^r of the Nancy Brigantine, who informed me, that he himself was not sure where he was to go, But that I might speacke to M^r John Taylor the Owner which I immediatly did and he told me, that if the Rivers was open the Nancy would go to Holland, if not probably to London, and that I was extremely welcome to my passage. I then waited on Mr. Lacen and aquanted him of the same, and imediatly put my trunk and bundle on board. . . .

Freiday, 7th. Got out of bedd at 6 AM this morning. at 8 AM went. at 9 AM they began to haul out of the harbour and came to an Anchor in the Roads at 10 AM and lay in the road untill four keels of Coals was put on board, each keel being Twenty Tun, and they were all Onb^d by half an houre past noon. At 1 pm got under saile with the wind at N. B. E.³ with a verry high sea runing, a great deall of which she shipped all this afternoon. steered until midnight S. S. E.⁴

¹ At Sunderland, where no ships for Holland were to be found, the ice in the Dutch rivers precluding the voyage.

² Monk Wearmouth, opposite Sunderland.

³ *I. e.*, north by east.

⁴ From this time till noon of the 11th the brigantine sailed along the English coast, finally coming to anchor at Portsmouth, where the captain went ashore to sell his coal and where Harrower vainly sought passage to Holland.

Wednesday, 12th. This morning fine clear weather but hard frost. I waited onb^d. untill three pm for Cap^t Lacoers [?] returning. But when I found he did not I left a letter of thanks to him for his favours shown me, for he would take no passage money from me, Besides that he used me like a Brother making me sleep and eat with himself; I then went ashore and immediately set out for London with no more cash in my pocket [but] 1s. 8½d. St^r. I pray, May God provide more for me and for all who are in strait. Immediatly as I left Portsmouth I fell into Comp^y and conversaiton on the road to whome I sold two pair of stock-ins 4/6d. it being the price they cost me in Zetland. I traveled four Miles this afternoon and lodged all night at Post down¹ bridge and the House had a Battery of Twelve Canon round it. here I supped on eight Oisters and 1d. and ½ worth of Bread, with a poynt of strong and a poynt of small beer which [cost] me 3d., being in all 4½d. for supper, here I paid 3d. for my bedd, and it was warmed with a warming pan, this being the first time I ever seed it done.

Thursday, 13th. Wind at E. so thick that I could not see above 100 yards distance. I crossed over Post down hill and Breackfast at Handen,² and after crossing a large barren Common of that name I dinned at Petersfield and then Got as far as Raik in the County of Sussex where I staid all night, having traviled twenty miles this [day] which is more than I did expect carring my Box and Bundle on my back; They have for firing here, nothing but a kind [of] heath like flaws.³ at this place I paid 3d. for my bedd, My diet being all the old storry, Bread, Cheese and beer, and I hade a Rush Candle to light me to bedd.

Freiday, 14th. This morning I sold in my lodgings sundry articles to the amount of 18/9d. St^r which Articles cost me £1.5/6 St^r. So that necessity obliged me to lose 6/9d. . . .⁴

Sunday, 16th. This day after breackfast and read^s some Chapters on a Newtestament I found in my room, I made the two following verses which I here insert below.

My absent friends God bless, and those,
my wife and Children dear;
I pray for pardon to my foes,
And for them sheds a tear.
At Epsom here this day I ly,
Repenting my past sins;
Praying to Jesus for his mercy,
And success to my friends.

Here I hade an extream good dinner in Publick, for sixpence. in the Afternoon I took a Walk and seed round this place a great many fine Houses and gardens most of them belonging to Londoners.

¹ Portsdown.

² Horndean.

³ Flax.

⁴ Harrower then walked on by way of Godalming and Guildford to Epsom, where he spent Sunday.

[*Tuesday*], 18th. This day I got to London and was like a blind man without a guide, not knowing where to go being freindless and having no more money but fifteen shillings and eight pence farthing a small sum to enter London with ; But I trust in the mercys of God who is a rich provider and am hopefull before it is done some way will cast up for me. I took up my lodging at the old ship Tavern in little Hermitage street,¹ Mr. George Newton being the landlord, but in Prison for debt at present.

Wednesday, 19th. This day I shifted my cloaths and put on a clean Ruffled Shirt, clean Britches and waistcoat and my Brown Coat, I not having any other cloaths on ever since I left Lerwick but my blew Jacket and Bigg Coat above it and a plain shirt. At 11 AM I called to see Cap^t Perry, but was told he would not be at home untill 5 pm. Having eat nothing for 24 houres, I dinned in my Lodging this day which cost me 1/2 St^r. After dinner I took a walk with the mate of a ship a Scotsman who carried me through Virginia street, London street, part of White Chappel street, down to London Hospitall, through Ragg fair, the Minnories, Round Tour hill, and the Tour, through Saint Catharins, and Bur street and so home.

A 5 pm called again at Cap^t Perrys and the first face I saw was Willie Holcraw of Coningsburgh² who I found staid here as a servant, and while I was speacking to him, Cap^t Perry came home and he immediatly knew me, and desired me to walk in which I did, and after sitting some time and drinking some tea, I called Cap^t Perry aside and made my Intentions known to him, at same time begged his advice and assistance ; He told me he hardly thought there would be any Business got for me in London. But told me to call on him at the Jamacia Coffee House to morrow at Change time. I then went home. and soon went to Bedd.

Thursday, 20th. This morning breakfast at home and paid 6d. for it. At noon called at the Jamacia Coffee House and soon after seed Cap^t Perry and waited here and Change untill 3 pm but no appearance of any Business for me. the time I was in the Coffee house I drank 3ds. worth of punch, and I was obliged to make it serve me for Dinner. at night I hade 1/2d. worth of bread and 1d. of Cheese and a poynt of Porter for supper it being all I cou'd afford.

Freiday, 21st. This morning I seed an advertisement for Bookeepers and Clerks to go to a Gentlemen [at] Philadelphia. I went as it directed to N^o. 1 in Catharine Court princes street, but when I came there I was told they were served. I then waited again on Cap^t Perry untill after 3 pm But to no purpose. I this day offered to go steward of a ship bound to Maryland but could not get the birth. This day I was 3 or 4 miles through London and seed S^t Paul's Church, the Bank of England where

¹ In Wapping, near the London Docks.

² Or Cunningsburgh, a village about eight miles south of Lerwick. The name Halcrow appears frequently in the documents printed as appendixes to the *Diary of the Reverend James Mill, Minister of the Parishes of Dunrossness, Sandwick and Cunningsburgh* (Scottish History Society, V.).

I seed the gold lying in heaps, I also seed Summerst house,¹ Gild hall, Drury Lane, Covingarden,² Adelphus Buildings and several other pleaces. I then returnd and near my lodgings I dinned at an eating house and hade 4d. worth of roast Beiff 1d. worth of bread and a poynt of small beer, in all 5½d.

Saturday, 22d. This morning I seed an advertisement in the Publick ledger for a Messenger to a publick Lodge, Sallery 15/ St^r per week and another advertisement for an under Clerk to a Merch^t to both which I wrote answers and went to the places apointed, and found at each place more than a dozen of Letters before me, so that I hade litle expectation that way they being all weel aquanted and I a stranger. I then went to change to see if any thing would cas[t] up but to no purpose, so I returned hom at 4 pm and spent the evening in a verry sollitary manner supping on bread and Cheese as usuall.

Sunday, 23d. This morning I drank some purle for breackfast and then I took a walk in the forenoon through severall streets, and at 1 pm I returned to the eating house I hade formerly been at and dinned which cost me 6½ today having hade 1d. worth of pudding more than I formerly hade. In the afternoon I went to a Methodists meeting. the Text was in the V Chap: Mathew and the 20th Verse. After sermon I came home and being solitary in my room I made the following Verses which I insert on the other side of this leaf.

Now at London in a garret room I am,
here frendless and forsaken ;
But from the Lord my help will come,
Who trusts in him are not mistaken.

When freinds on earth do faint and faile,
And upon you their backs do turn ;
O Truly seek the Lord, and he will
Them comfort that do murn.

I'll unto God my prayer make,
to him my case make known ;
And hopes he will for Jesus sake,
Provide for me and soon.

Munday, 24th. This morning I wrote six tickets to give to ship-masters at Change seeking a steward's birth onb^d some ship, but could not get a birth. I also wrote a petition in generall to any Merch^t or Tradesman setting forth my present situation, and the way in which I hade been brought up and where I hade served and in what station, at same time offering to serve any for the bare suport of life fore some time. But all to no effect, for all places here at present are intierly carried by

¹ Somerset House. Not the building now so called, but its predecessor, the old mansion of the Protector Somerset.

² Covent Garden.

freinds and Intrest, And many Hundreds are sterving for want of employment, and many good people are begging.

Tuesday, 25th. Having heard last night that John Ross sloop was come from Zetland, I took a Boat this morning and went onboard her and seed him and Robert Irvine. And then I hade the happiness to hear that my wife and Childrein were all well on the 3^d Inst it being the day they left Bressaysound.¹ The rest of this day I was employed in presenting the Petition I hade drawn up on the 24th Inst to severall Merch^{ts} and others and doing all I cou'd to get into business of some kind near home but all to no effect.

Wednesday, 26th. This day I being reduced to the last shilling I hade was obliged to engage to go to Virginia for four years as a school-master for Bedd, Board, washing and five pound during the whole time. I have also wrote my wife this day a particular Acco^t of every thing that has happned to me since I left her untill this date; At 3 pm this day I went on board the Snow Planter Cap^t Bowers Com^r for Virginia now lying at Ratliff Cross, and imediatly as I came Onb^d I rec^d my Hammock and Bedding. at 4 pm came Alex^r Steuart onb^d the same Ship. he was Simbisters Serv^t² and had only left Zetland about three weeks before me. we were a good deall surprised to meet w^t on another in this place.

Thursday, 27th. This day ranie weather. the ships crew imployed in rigging the ship under the Direction of the mate and I was imployed in getting my Hammock slung. at 2 pm came onb^d Alex^r Burnet nephew to Mr. Francis Farquharson writter in Edinburgh and one Samuel Mitchell a Cooper from Yorkshire and both entred into the berth and Mace³ with Stewart and me.

Saturday, 29th. This day came on b^d Alex^r Kennedy a young man from Edinb^r who hade been a Master Cooper there and a Glasgow Man by trade a Barber both which we took into our Mace, which compleated it being five Scotsmen and one Yorkshireman, and was always called the Scots mace, And the Cap^t told me he was from the Toun of Aberbothick in Scotland, but th^t he [had] not been there since he was fifteen years of age but hade been always in the Virginia trade which I was very glad to hear.

Munday, 31st. This day I went ashore and bought a penknife, a paper Book, and some paper and pens and came on board to Dinner. It is surprising to see the N^o of good tradesmen⁴ of all kinds, th^t come onb^d every day.

Freiday, February 4th. This day at 7 AM unmoored from Ratliff-cross and fell down the river with the tide there being no wind. This day I seed Deptfoord, Greenage⁵ Hospitall, Blackwall and Ullage.⁶ at 1

¹ The harbor of Lerwick.

² *I. e.*, a servant of John Bruce Stewart of Symbister and Bigton, an important proprietor in the south of Shetland. *Diary of Rev. James Mill*, pp. 22, 151, etc.

³ Mess.

⁴ *I. e.*, artisans.

⁵ Greenwich.

⁶ Woolwich.

pm came to an Anchor a little below the $\frac{1}{2}$ way house. At 6 pm got under way again and fell down untill quite dark and then came to an Anchor a little above Pourfleet.

Sunday, 6th. At 7 AM got under way with a fair wind and clear w^t and at 11 AM came to an anchor off Gravesend and immediatly the Merch^t came onboard and a Doctor and clerk with him and while the Clerk was filling up the Indentures the doctor search'd every serv^t to see that they were sound when . . . seventy five were Intend¹ to Cap^t Bowres for four Years.

Munday, 7th. This forenoon imployed in getting in provisions and water. at 4 pm put a servant ashore extreemly bade in a fever, and then got under sail for Virginia with seventy Servants on board all indented to serve four years there at their differint Occoupations myself being one of the Number and Indented for a Clerk and Bookeeper, But when I arrived there I cou'd get no such birth as will appear in the place.² At pm we came to an anchor at the nore it blowing and snowing verry hard.

Tuesday, 8th. At 5 AM made saile from the Nore with the wind at W. N. W. Clear weather and blowing hard. at 2 pm got off a Pillot from Deall to take our River Pillot ashore for which Boat Cap^t Bowers paid one and a half Guineas, and after buying some Gin here we stood streight to sea Under Close R. T. sails³ and our fore saile, a verry high sea running all this day.

Sunday, 13th. Wind at V. B. S.⁴ squally weather. Eight saile more at anchor in Company w^t us. At noon the Indented servants was like to mutiny against the Cap^t for putting them to Allowance of bread and Mate, but it was soon quelled, Our mace not joyning with the rest. in the afternoon he went ashore, But before he left the Ship he called me and begged I wou'd stand by the Mate if there arose any disturbance among the rest of the servants.

Saturday, 26th. Wind at N. B. E. fine moderate weather. got up Yd^s and Topmasts. at 10 AM The Cap^t went ashore to get more fresh provisions, at 4 pm he came onb^d from Portsmouth with Bread, Beiff Pork and Water and then imediatly got under sail and stood out to sea. At this time we hade three men sick onb^d one with the flux, one with the fever and Ego,⁵ and one frost bitt in his feet. At 11 pm the wind came all round to the N. V. Blowing verry hard. at Midnight close reefd the topsails.

Sunday, 27th. Wind at N. V. at 4 AM Tack'd ship. At same time the man who was bade with the flux was found dead in his hammock. at 8 he was sewed up in it and at 9 AM he was burried in the sea after reading the service of the Dead over him, which was done by the Mate.

¹ Indented.

² This and the entry of May 25, *post*, show that the entries down to the latter date are not in the absolute sense contemporary; but a passage in a letter, under August 7, 1774, seems to indicate that daily notes were taken.

³ *I. e.*, close-reefed top-sails.

⁴ *I. e.*, west by south.

⁵ Ague.

Freiday, March 11th. Wind weather and course as yesterday. this forenoon clear but verry squally like. at 4 pm stowed the Maintopsail and at 7 pm stowed fore Top saile and close reefd the Main saile and scuded under it. The wind blowing excessive hard and a verry high sea running still from the westward. at 8 pm was oblidge to batten down both fore and main hatches, and a little after I really think there was the oddest shene¹ betwixt decks that ever I heard or seed. There was some sleeping, some spewing, . . . some daming, some Blasting their leggs and thighs, some their liver, lungs, lights and eyes, And for to make the shene the odder, some curs'd Father, Mother, Sister, and Brother.

Saturday, 12th. Wind weather and course as before. we are now past the skirts of the Bay of Biscay and entred into the Atlantick Ocean, going at the rate of 8 knots per houre.

Sunday, 13th. Wind at S. S. E. course V. B. S. at 11 AM Moderate weather. let out all reefs. at noon in Latitude 44 North per observation. This afternoon got most of sick and ailing to deck the number of which I cannot really now ascertain. But I thank God I have as yet kept my health weel. At 3 pm there was two servants put in Irons for wanting other than what was served. But they were soon released on their asking pardon and promising to behave better.

Sunday, 27th. Wind, weather, and course as yesterday. at 8 AM got up all hammocks and the sick likways they being now in number about 37, there being th[ree] sick in our mace Viz^t Stewart, Burnet, and the Yorkshire Cooper. at noon we all betwixt decks cleand out, and washed with wineggar.

Thursday, 31st. Wind weather and course as before. The sick are now increased to the number of fifty betwixt decks, besides three in the steerage Viz^t two seamen and a passanger.

Sunday, April 3d. Wind weather and course as before. Last night Alex^r Stewart was so high in the fever that I sat up with him all night, and Burnet and the Cooper are still verry bad, but not so high as Stewart. This day the Cap^t ordered some Cock and hen to be killed and fresh broth made for the sick.

Munday, 4th. Wind weather and course still as before and jogging on from 4 to 6 knots at an average per houre. at 5 pm I was oblidge to get Stewart blister'd and sat up again all night with him, having become his nurse for Country sake he being the first in the Mace that was taken ill, and I was not sure how soon it might be my own fate. But thank God I am as yet well and hearty. This night I supped on a dish called Scratchplatters. it is made of biscuits broack small and soaked in water until they are soft, and then Winegar, oile, salt, and Onions cut small put to it, and supped with spoons.

Wednesday, 6th. . . . I have wore no Britches nor stockins since we got into the trade winds² only a pair of long trousers down to my buckles. And this day having put on a shorter pair untill my longest

¹ Scene.

² Lat. this day 27° 37' N. On the tenth they were near Barbadoes.

pair was wash'd, I got both my Ancles burned by the sun, it is so verry hot here.

Tuesday, 19th. . . . This day I brought up M^r. Jones¹ Journall for five days back, also Cap^t. Bowers Journall for four days back and at same time begged me to mark the Logg Book and ordred that Whoever hade the charge of watch to aquant me what the ship went per Logg &c.

Thursday, 21st. This morning a young lad, one of the serv^{ts} being verry ill with the Fever and Ague, he begged me to apply to Mr. Jones the Cheif Mate, and told me he cou'd give him something that would cure him; Mr. Jones first desired me to give him a Womite and then wrote the following lines on a slip of paper and after folding it up gave it to me, to see it tyed up in the corner of his handkirchif or Cravat and wear it at his breast next his skin with strick charge not to look at it himself nor let any other person see it or look at it untill he was got wel. The words are as follows.

When Jesus saw the Cross he trembled,
The Jews said unto him why tremblest thou,
You have neither got an Ague nor a fever.
Jesus Answered and said unto them
I have neither got an Ague nor a fever
But whosoever keepeth my words
Shall neither have an Ague nor a fever.

Mr. Jones told me when he gave me the above copy it [was] a ser-tain cure for the fever and Ague, the paitient being first womited and then wearing the lines as above directed, But if they show it to any or look at it themselves it will have no effect.

Freiday, 22d. This day I was seased with a sever Cold and Aching in my bones, But I thank God I am weel car'd for and has every thing sent me from the Cabin I can desire.

Wednesday, 27th. This morning I am fairly got the better of my cold and the Aching in my bones and am able to stir about. . . . At 7 pm we made Cape Henry and the Coast plain. we then highesed our flagg for a Pillot Boat and at pm we hade four Pillot boats along side and Cap^t. Bows took one M^r. Cooper who brought us within the Capes, and to an Anchor at 10 pm where we lay all night.

Thursday, 28th. At 7 AM the Pillot wegh'd Anchor and wrought the ship up to Hampton Roads where we came to an Anchor at 10 AM. This morning I was employ'd in Making out a Clean list of the servants names and Business and age, and how soon I was done² Cap^t. Bowers went ashore in the Pillot boat to Hamton on Elizabeth river. we have some goods to put out before we leave this place. at night, a deal of Thunder, lightning and rain.

Monday, May 2d. Wind as before, fine fair warm weather. got out the rest of the goods that was for Hampton. at 2 pm the Cap^t. Carried

¹ James Jones, chief mate, then sick.

² I. e., as soon as I was done.

five serv^{ts} ashore to Hampton in order to sell their Indentures, But returned again at Midnight with [out] selling any more but one Boat Builder. he brought onb^d with him four Barrells Virginia Pork and one Puncheon D^o rum, and 3 live hogs.

Tuesday, 3d. Wind at W. N. W. fine moderate weather. at 6 AM weigh'd Anchor from Hampton Roads, and stood out to sea untill we made the Entry of Rappahannock river, which we did at 10 AM, proceeding up the same for Fredericksburgh. at 6 pm came to an anchor at Arrabanna.¹

Freiday, 6th. Wind as before. at 4 AM got under saile and stood up the river and at 9 AM passed by the Town of Hobshole² and let it on our Larboard hand as we did the Town of Arrabanna. at Hobshole there was five Glasgow ships and an English Brigantine lying. at 2 pm we passed by Leedstown³ on our Starboard hand where there was a ship from London lying with Convicts. at night came to anchor about 6 Miles above Leedstown.

Saturday, 7th. This morning thick weather. at 10 AM got under way and stood up to Port Royall on our Larboard hand where we arrived at 2 pm, The Cap^t going ashore to change his Pillot, and at 4 pm returned with Another and we immediatly got under way again and got about 7 miles above Port Royall before dark. all along both sides of the River there is nothing to be seen but woods in the blossom, Gentlemens seats and Planters houses.

Sunday, 8th. Early this morning died the old German, a man between 60 and 70 years of age. at 5 AM weigh'd Anchor and tow'd and warped up, it being quite calm. at 9 AM was obliged to come to an Anchor, and ly untill the tide made, and then weigh'd and got about 3 Miles above Port Morton where we lay all night. this forenoon we lost one of our live hogs, he Jumping overboard and swimming ashore and immediatly got into the woods. at night the Cap^t carried the old German ashore and Burried him somewhere in the woods.

Tuesday, 10th. At 2 AM weigh'd and stood up with the tide, came to an anchor at 6 AM and lay untill Do. 8 when we weigh'd with a fair wind and got to our Moorings at 6 pm at the Toun of Fredericksburgh.

Wednesday, 11th. At 10 AM Both Coopers and the Barber from our Mace went ashore upon tryall. At night one Daniel Turner a serv^t returned onb^d from Liberty so drunk that he abused the Cap^t and chief Mate and Boatswan to a verry high degree, which made to be horse whip^t put in Irons and thumb screwed. on houre afterward he was unthumbscrewed, taken out of the Irons, but then he was hand cuffed, and gagged all night.

Thursday, 12th. All hands quite on board this day. Turner un-gagged But continued in handcuffs.

¹ Urbanna, in Middlesex County.

² Hobb's Hole, in Richmond County. See AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, V. 313, 314, Journal of Philip Fithian, August 2 of this same year.

³ Leeds, in Westmoreland.

Freiday, 13th. This forenoon put ashore here what bale goods we hade remaining onboard. in the afternoon Mr. Burnet, Stewart and myself went ashore on liberty to take a walk and see the Toun, who's principal street is about half an English Mile long, the houses generally at a little distance one from another, some of them being built of wood and some of them of brick, and all covered with wood in the form of sclates about four Inches broad, which when painted blue you wou'd not know it from a house sclated with Isedell slate.¹ In this Toun the Church,² the Counsell house, the Tolbooth the Gallows and the Pillory are all within 130 yd^s of each other. The Market house is a large brick Building a litle way from the Church. here we drank some Bottles of beer of their own brewing and some bottles of Cyder for which we paid 3½ per bottle of each. returned on board in the evening. Turner still in handcuffs.

Munday, 16th. This day severalls came onb^d to purchase serv^{ts}. Indentures and among them there was two Soul drivers. they are men who make it their business to go onb^d all ships who have in either Servants or Convicts and buy sometimes the whole and sometimes a parcell of them as they can agree, and then they drive them through the Country like a parcell of Sheep untill they can sell them to advantage, but all went away without buying any.

Tuesday, 17th. This day M^r. Anderson the Merch^t sent for me into the [cabin] and verry genteely told me that on my recomendations he would do his outmost to get me settled as a Clerk or bookeeper if not as a schoolmaster which last he told me he thought wou'd turn out more to my advantage upon being settled in a good famely.

The ships crew and servants employed in getting ashore all the cask out of the hould, no sales th^s day.

Wednesday, 18th. This day the ships crew and servants imployed in getting out the ballast and unrigging the ship. One Cooper, one Blacksmith and one Shoemaker were settled with Masters this day.

Thursday, 19th. One Farmer's time sold and one Cabinet Maker on tryall.

Saturday, 21st. This day one M^r. Cowly a man 'twixt fifty and sixty years of age, a serv^t, also three sons of his their ages from eight to fourteen were all settled with one McDonald a Scotchman.

Munday, 23d. This morning a great number of Gentlemen and Ladies driving into Town it being an annuall Fair^a day and tomorrow the day of the Horse races. at 11 AM M^r. Anderson begged to settle as a schoolmaster with a friend of his one Colonel Daingerfield⁴ and told

¹ Easdale or Eisdale, a small island among the Hebrides, entirely composed of slate, and at this time famous for its quarries.

² Of the parish of St. George.

³ A law of 1738 (Hening, V. 82), ordered that fairs should be held at Fredericksburg twice a year for the sale of "cattle, victuals, provisions, goods, wares and merchandizes." The law, continued from time to time, had last been renewed in 1769.

⁴ Col. William Daingerfield of Belvidera was the son of Edwin Daingerfield and Mary Bassett, daughter of Col. William Bassett of Eltham. The Bassetts were near of

me he was to be in Town tomorrow, or perhaps tonight, and how soon he came¹ he shou'd aquant me. at same time all the rest of the servants were ordred ashore to a tent at Fredericksb^s and severall of their Indentures were then sold. about 4 pm I was brought to Colonel Daingerfield, when we imediatly agreed and my Indenture for four years was then delivered him and he was to send for me the next day. at same time ordred to get all my dirty Cloaths of every kind washed at his expense in Toun; at night he sent me five shillings onb^d by Cap^t Bowers to keep my pocket.

Tuesday, 24th. This morning I left the Ship at 6 AM having been sixteen weeks and six days on board her. I hade for Breackfast after I came ashore one Chappin² sweet milk for which I paid 3½ Cur⁷. at 11 AM went to see a horse race about a mille from Toun, where there was a number of Genteel Company as well as others. here I met with the Colonel again and after some talk with him he gave me cash to pay for washing all my Cloaths and something over. The reace was gain'd by a Bay Mare, a white boy ridder. There was a gray Mare started with the Bay a black boy ridder but was far distant the last heat.³

Wednesday, 25th. I Lodged in a Tavern last night and paid 7½ for my Bedd and 7½ for my breackfast. this morning a verry heavy rain untill 11 AM. Then I rec^d my Linens &c. all clean washed and packing every thing up I went onboard the ship and Bought this Book for which I paid 18d. St^r. I also bought a small Divinity book called the Christian Monitor and a spelling book, both at 7½ and an Arithmetick at 1/6d. all for my Acco^t.

Thursday, 26th. This day at noon the Colonel sent a Black with a cuple of Horses for me and soon after I set out on Horseback and aravied at his seat of Belvidera about 3 pm and after I hade dined the Colonel took me to a neat little house at the upper end of an Avenue of planting at 500 yd^s from the Main house, where I was to keep the school, and Lodge myself in it.

This place is verry pleasantly situated on the Banks of the River Rapahannock about seven miles below the Toun of Fredericksburgh and the school's right above the Warff so that I can stand in the door and pitch a stone onboard of any ship or Boat going up or coming down the river.

Freiday, 27th. This morning about 8 AM the Colonel delivered his three sons to my Charge to teach them to read write and figure. his oldest son Edwin 10 years of age, intred into two syllables in the spelling book, Bathourest [Bathurst] his second son six years of age in the Alphabete and William his third son 4 years of age does not know the letters.

kin to Martha Washington. Col. Daingerfield's grandfather was William Daingerfield, who married Elizabeth Bathurst, daughter of Lancelot Bathurst of Virginia, fifth son of Sir Edward Bathurst of Sussex, England.

¹ *I. e.*, as soon as he came.

² A Scottish measure, about equivalent to an American quart.

³ The Fredericksburg races were by this time a long-established institution. See Mr. W. G. Stanard's notes on Virginia horse-racing in the *Virginia Magazine*, II. 293-305.

he has likewise a Daughter whose name is Hanna Basset Years of age. Soon after we were all sent for to breakfast to which we had tea, Bread, Butter and cold meat and there was at table the Colonel, his Lady, his Children, the housekeeper and myself. At 11 AM the Colonel and his Lady went some where to pay a visite, he upon horseback and she in her Charriot. At 2 pm I dined with the Housekeeper the Children and a stranger Lady. at 6 pm I left school, and then I eat plenty of fine strawberries, but they neither drink Tea in the afternoon nor eat any supper here for the most part. My school Houres is from 6 to 8 in the morning, in the forenoon from 9 to 12 and from 3 to 6 in the afternoon.

Sunday, 29th. There is no church nearer Belvidera than Fredericksburgh, and for want of a saddle I was obliged to stay at home all day and when I was alone in the school I thought on the following verses.

1st

In Virginia now I am, at Belvidera settled,
but may they ever mercy find, who had the cause
that I am from my sweet wife separated
And Oblidged to leave my Infant Children Fatherless.

2^d

As a schoolmaster, I am here ;
And must for four years, remain so ;
May I endeavour the Lord to fear,
And always his commands do.

3^d

For in Gods strength I do rely,
that he at his appointed time,
Will bring me back my family,
if I his precepts do but mind.

4th

O May my God provide for them,
Who unto me are near and dear ;
tho they afar off me are from
O Jesus keep them in thy fear.

5th

Do thou enable me to labour,
and my fortune do thou mind ;
that what I get by thy favour,
I to my family may send.

6th

O Lord my God do thou them save
from dangers and from death
And may they food and rayment have
and for the same may thankfull be while they have breath.

7th

And may we all ever gloryfie thy name
and loud thy praises sing
and unto all make known the fame
of Jehova our almighty king.

8th

O ever blessed be the Lord,
the King of all the earth is he,
let us exalt his name with one Accord
and thankfull unto him be ye.

Finis.

After dinner I took a walk about a Miles distance from the house along the highway, and by the road side seed a Corn Mill and another pretty house called Snow Creek belonging to the Colonel.

Tuesday, 31st. This day there was about fifty white Ewes and Lambs feeding 'twix the main house and the school door and so tame that they wou'd come and look in at the door and see what we was doing. the lambs here are as large at this date as in Zetland at Michelsmass, being of the english bread.

Wednesday, June 1st. This day there was prayers in all the Churches in Virginia¹ on Acco^t of the disagreement at present betwixt great Brittain and her Colonies in North America, On Acco^t of their not agreeing to pay a duty on Tea laid on them by the british parliment and the Bostonians destroying a Quantity of Tea belonging to the British East India Comp^y in 1773.

Freiday, 3d. This day I eat green pease at dinner, this being the last of them this season here.

Wednesday, 8th. This day I eat plenty of fine ripe Cherries brought out of the woods this morning by the Colonel.

Freiday, 10th. Rec^d two pair fine new brown thread stockings. Below is an Inventory of the Cloaths &c I brought to Belvidera with me Viz.

One Superfine Brown Cloath Coat full mounted.
One D^o vest Coat.
One floored² silk D^o
One fine marsyled³ D^o
One Brown Duffel D^o
One pair new black Stockins Britches
One pair new Doe skin D^o
One pair flannen Drawers.
One pair Osenbürg⁴ D^o

¹ The fast-day decreed by the Virginia House of Burgesses. See Jefferson's autobiography.

² Flowered.

³ Marseilles.

⁴ Osnaburg.

Six Ruffled Shirts	
five plain white D°	
One Cheque D°	
One Blue Cloath Jacket	
Seven Musline Stocks	
One Black silk Cravate	
One pair Ribbed Cotton Stockins	
Ten pair worsted D°	
One new Hat and one D° Wigg.	
Five pocket Napkins.	
two hand Towels	
two pair Trousers	
One pair Shoes ; with Pinchback shoe, stock and knee buckles.	
One trunk, with fine lock and hinges.	

{ Several other
Articles besides
what are here
mentioned but
are too tedious
to mention.

Saturday, 11th. At 9 AM left the school and went a fishing on the River with the Colonel his eldest [Son] and another Gentleman in two Canoes, Mrs. Dangerfield another Lady and the other two boys mett us at Snow Creek in the Chair at 2 pm when we all dined on fish under a tree.

Sunday, 12th. This day at Church at Fredericksburgh and at same time settled a Correspondance at Glasgow for getting letters from home, by their being put under cover to Messrs. Anderson and Horsburgh Merch^s in D° and the expence charged to Mr. Glassel¹ Merch^t in Fredericksb^g Virginia.

Tuesday, 14th. This morning entred to school William Pattie son to John Pattie wright, and Salley Evens daughter to Thomas Evens Planter. This day I wrote my wife a particular Acco^t of all my transactions since I wrote her from London 26th Jan^y last, the Coppy of which I have by me.²

Thursday, 16th. This eveng the Colonel told me he hade about 400 Acres of land in wheat and as much in Indian Corn every year and that he comonly exported about 3600 bushels of wheat every year besides serving his own Family. But that he did not expect to have above the one half th^s year owing to a strong frost they had in Aprile last.

Freiday, 17th. This day rec^d two pair new Rushia drill britches and two new short Coats of Brown Holland.

Munday, 20th. This morning entred to school Philip and Dorothea Edge's Children of M^r Benjaman Edge Planter. Same day Colonel Dangerfield began to cut down his wheat, which they do with a syth.

Tuesday, 21st. This day M^r Samuel Edge Planter came to me and begged me to take a son of his to school who was both deaf and dum, and I consented to try what I cou'd do with him.

¹ John Glassell was a Scotsman who came to Fredericksburgh and became a prominent merchant there. A wharf there is still known as Glassell's. He returned to Scotland at the beginning of the Revolutionary War. His only daughter, whose marriage-portion was fifty thousand pounds sterling, married in 1820 Lord John Campbell, afterward the seventh duke of Argyll; and was the mother of the late duke.

² See its text under August 7, *post*.

Thursday, 23d. This day entred to school John Edge son to the above named M^r. Sam: Edge. he is a lad about 14 years of age and is both deaf and dum.¹

Saturday, 25th. This afternoon I went and took a walk in the wheat field and under a tree I filled all my pockets of as fine walnuts as ever I eat, But so hard shell that I was oblidge to have a hammer to breack them.

Sunday, 26th. After Breackfast I took a walk 3 Miles to Mr. Edge's, the dum lad's fathers where I dined and drank some grogg and returned home in the afternoon. at night I had a small Congregation of Negroes, learing their Catechisim and hearing me read to them.

Sunday, July 3d. At home all the forenoon, in the afternoon went to see One Mr. Richards an Overseer and his wife where I eat plenty of honney out of the Comb, it being taken out of a Beehive in a tree in the woods last night.

Freiday, 8th. After school houres I went two Miles to see the Taylor who made my Cloaths he being a Brittoner but married to a Buckskine,² and I found his wife and Daughters drinking tea, at which I joyned them, The Taylor not being at home.

Tuesday, 12th. Sold the spelling book that I bought Onb^d the Planter 25th May last, and got the same money for it that I paid for the Christian Monitor and it.

Saturday, 16th. This afternoon the Colonel finished the cutting down of His wheat which cost of wages to hired people £23 : 10 Curr^s besides their victualls and drink.

Munday, 18th. This morning entred to School Lewis Richards. Same day I put on a pair of newshoes made in Fredericksburgh of English calf leather the price of them 12/6 Cur^r. Same day gave one pair of old worsted stockins for 22 foot of Gum plank 10 Inch broad and one thick to make me a Chest.

Tuesday, 19th. On Freiday 15th Ins^t John Edge the Dumb lad left the school at 6 pm and has not returned since.

Wednesday, 20th. On Munday 4th Ins^t at 6 pm William Pattie left the school and has not returned since.

Munday, 25th. Nothing remarkable. Jn^e Edge return^d to school.

Sunday, August 7th. This afternoon meeting accidentally with a Gentleman here who was on his way to London I wrote my wife a few lines by him having wrote her fully 14th June last but having omitted to

¹ Nothing in the diary surpasses in interest the entries relating to John Edge. He was, in fact, so far as is known, the first deaf mute instructed in America. No instance so early occurs in Dr. Alexander Graham Bell's "Historical Notes concerning the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf," in the *Association Review* for February, 1900, and subsequent numbers. John Bolling of Cobbs, Virginia, the first American deaf mute to receive an education, was sent to John Braidwood's school in Edinburgh in 1771, and did not return till 1783. What methods Harrower used, we can only guess. It is highly improbable that he knew those of Braidwood, who carefully kept them secret; and Cobbs was far away. For subsequent details of Harrower's experiment, see the entries of July 19 and 25, 1774, March 18 and May 20, 1775, but especially the letter of December 6, 1774.

²I. e., American.

insert the Coppy in it's proper place I now do it here before I insert the coppy of my second Letter to her from this country.

BELVIDERA 14th June 1774.

My Dearest Life

I wrote you from London on Wednesday 26th Jan^y last which Im hopefull came safe to hand, and found you and my dear Infants in perfect health, and am hopefull this will find both you and them in the same state, As I am at present and have been I bless God since I left you. You will remember when I wrote you last, I informed you that I was to go for Baltimore in Maryland, But I altred my design in that and came here it being a more healthy pleace. I sailed from London on Freiday the 4th Feb^y last, and arrived in Hampton roads in Virginia on the 27 April, having been a Month of the time at Spithead in England. As to particulars of our Voyage &^{ca} it would take up too much room here to insert it. But I have a Journal of every days transactions and remarcable Occurances since the morning I left you which will be amusing to you when please God we are spared to meet, for I design to see and prepare a way for you all in this Country how soon I am able.—I shall now aquant you w^t my situation in this Country. I am now settled with on Colonel W^m Dangerfield Esq^r of Belvidera, on the Banks of the River Rappahannock about 160 miles from the Capes or sea mouth, and seven Miles below the Toun of Fredericksburgh. My business is to teach his Children to read write and figure, Edwin his oldest son about 8 years of [age] Bathurest his second 6 years of age and William his youngest son 4 years of age. he has also a Daughter whose name is Hanna Basset. I came to this place on Thursday 26th May and next morning I received his three sons into my charge to teach, the two youngest boys I got in A: B: C. and the oldest Just begun to syllab and I have now the two youngest spelling and the oldest reading. I am obliged to teach in the English method which was a little aquard to me at first but now quite easy. I am also obliged to talk english the best I can,¹ for Lady Dangerfield speacks nothing but high english, and the Colonel hade his Education in England and is a verry smart Man. As to my agreement it is as follows Viz! I am obliged to continue with Col^l Dangerfield for four years if he insists on it, and for teaching his own children I have Bed, Board, washing and all kind of Cloaths during the above time, and for what schoolars I can get more than his Children I have five shillings currency per Quarter for each of them, which is equall to four shillings sterling, and I expect ten or twelve to school next week, for after I hade been here eight days and my abilities and my behavior sufficiently tried, the Colonel rode through the neighbouring Gentlemen and Planters in order to procure scollars for me, so that I hope in a short time to make something of it. And as I have no Occasion to spend a farthing on myself every shill^g I make shall be carefully remitted you, for your support and my Dear Infants. But I

¹ The Norse language was not quite extinct in Shetland in 1774, according to Low, *Tour through the Islands of Orkney and Shetland*, and the ordinary speech of the islanders was a dialect much mixed with Norse words and forms.

must be some time here before any thing can be done, for you know every thing must have a beginning.

As to my living I eat at their own table, and our witualls are all Dressed in the English taste. we have for Breackfast either Coffie or Jaculate,¹ and warm Loaf bread of the best floor, we have also at table warm loaf bread of Indian corn, which is extreamly good but we use the floor bread always at breackfast. for Dinner smoack'd bacon or what we cal pork ham is a standing dish either warm or cold. when warm we have greens with it, and when cold we have sparrow grass. we have also either warm roast pigg, Lamb, Ducks, or chickens, green pease or any thing else they fancy. As for Tea there is none drunk by any in this Government since 1st June last, nor will they buy a 2^{ds} worth of any kind of east India goods, which is owing to the difference at present betwixt the Parliment of great Britton and the North Americans about laying a tax on the tea; and I'm afraid if the Parliment do not give it over it will cause a total revolt as all the North Americans are determined to stand by one another, and resolute on it that they will not submit. I have the news paper sent me to school regularly every week by the Col^l. —Our family consists of the Col^l. his Lady and four Children a house-keeper an Overseer and myself all white. But how many blacks young and old the Lord only knows for I belive there is about thirty that works every day in the field besides the servants about the house; such as Gardner, livery men and pages, Cooks, washer and dresser, sewster and waiting girle. They wash here the whitest that ever I seed for they first Boyle all the Cloaths with soap, and then wash them, and I may put on clean linen every day if I please. My school is a neate litle House 20 foot long and 12 foot wide and it stands by itself at the end of an Avenue of planting about as far from the main house as Rob^t Forbes's² is from the burn, and there comes a bonny black bairn every morning to clean it out and make my bed, for I sleep in it by myself. I have a verry fine feather bed under me, and a pair of sheets, a thin fold of a Blanket and a Cotton bed spread is all my bed cloaths, and I find them just enough. as for myself I suppose you wou'd scarce know me now, there being nothing either brown, blew, or black about me but the head and feet, I being Dressed in short cloath Coat, vest Coat, and britches all made of white cotton without any linyng and thread stockings and wearing my own hair curled round like a wigg. at present a suite of Cloaths costs five and twenty shillings here of making which I really think verry high.

I was Sunday last at Fredericksburgh at church and I then settled a safe Correspondance for your letters to come to me, and shall give you

¹ Chocolate.

² In the "Annals of the County of Zetland", referred to in the introductory lines, *supra*, this entry is to be found, under date of 1767: "Compeared Robert Forbes and James Forbes, both Operative Masons in Lerwick, Who undertook to furnish and work all the Free Stone necessary in the foresaid Intended Tolbooth," etc. Passages in the letters of December 6, 1774, August 28 and September 8, 1775, which see, *post*, serve to identify the former of these two brothers with Harrower's former friend.

the proper directions below. As for myself I thank God I want for nothing that is necessary, But it brings tears from my eyes to think of you and my infants when at the same time it is not in my power at present to help you. But how soon I am able you may depend upon it. I have little else to say at present ; only may the great God who governs all things wisely support you and my Infants, and guide and direct you in all your ways.

I shall write you again soon and when you write me direct my letters as follows Viz: to John Harrower at the seat of Colonel W^m Dangerfield Esq: of Belvidera near Fredericksburgh on Rappahannock River Virginia; Then you must take half a sheet of paper and write another letter the contents of which may be as follows Viz! Gentlemen, being desired by my husband to send his letters under cover to you, You will please forward the inclosed by the first ship bound for any part in Virginia and charge M^r Glassel Mercht^t in Fredericksburgh with the expence you are at; I am yours &c^a Signed A. H. After you have closed my letter and directed it as above, You will inclose it in the above, and direct it as follows To Mess^{rs} Anderson and Horsburgh Merch^{ts} in Glasgow. You must get some person to fold up your letters properly and on who writes a clear Distinct hand to direct them. Pray write me verry particularly how it is with you and my D^r Infants, likeways any thing that is remarkable in the Country. I shall conclude this with offering my Comp^{ts} to all enquiring freinds if I have any and my sinceer prayers both evening and morn^g for you and my Children. My Blessing to you all, is all at present from my Dearest Jewell your ever aff^{to} Husband untill Death. Signed, John Harrower.

Addressed, To Mrs. John Harrower in Lerwick, Zetland.

2^d Letter from Virginia.

BELVIDERA 7 Aug^t 1774.

My Dearest Life

I wrote you verry fully 14th June last to which I refer you it being verry full, but meeting Accidentally Just now with a Gentleman bound to London, I have just time to write you a few lines while he is at Dinner to let you know that I am still in good health I thank God for it, and am hopefull this will find you and my D^r Infants the same. I gave you verry full Directions in my last how to write me but in case this should come to hand before it, I shall here again repeat them.—See Directions page 63.¹—If this or my other letter comes to hand before the Pacquet leaves Zetland for the last time this winter² pray do not fail to write

¹A reference to the preceding page of the manuscript book.

²The compiler of the eighth edition of *A Tour through the Island of Great Britain*, London, 1778, says, IV. 324, that the Shetlanders are deprived "of all foreign correspondence from October to April, during which time they hear nothing of what passes in other parts of the world. A known instance of this was, that though the Revolution [of 1688] happened to begin in November, they knew nothing of it till the May following." This is taken from Brand's *Brief Description of Orkney and Zetland*, 1701, (Pinkerton, III. 773) but was doubtless practically true seventy years later; for it will be observed, under date of May 27, 1775, *infra*, that Harrower's first letter from his wife, in answer to his letter of June 14, 1774, is dated March 1, 1775.

me verry fully by her. I have Just time to aquant you that I am settled here as a Schoolmaster and can really say with great truth that I never lived a genteel regulare life untill now. I shall write you again soon verry fully and untill then I am with my blessing to you my Dear and my Dear Infants Your ever Aff^{te} husb^d untill death—Signed—John Harrower.

Adressed, To Mrs. John Harrower, Lerwick, Zetland.

Tuesday, August 16th. Expecting a visit of one M^r Kennedy an Edinburgher, a Cooper now in Fredericksburgh, I this day sent to Toun for a Quart of the Best Vestindia Rum which cost me Eighteen pence Virginia Currancy.

Wednesday, 17th. This evening entred to school Thomas Brooks M^r Spotswoods¹ carpenter in order to learn Writing and Arithmetick at nights and on Sundays.²

Freiday, 19th. This day at noon Col^l Will^m Daingerfield finished his wheat harvest by getting the last of it brought home and stacked.

Sunday, 21st. At home teaching Brooks. Nothing remarcable.

• *Munday, 22d.* This afternoon Col^l Daingerfield begun to sow wheat again for the next years crope. They sow their wheat here in the field where there Indian Corn is growing and plough it into the ground, so that the Corn and wheat both Occopy the ground from this date untill January next and then the Corn is cut down.

Tuesday, 23d. This day at noon was finished at one of Col^l Daingerfields Barns a new Machine for beating out of wheat. it is a circle of 60 feet diameter in the center of which their is a paul [pole?] fixed in the ground from which there goes three beams that reach the outer edge of the great circle and betwixt the outer ends of them are fixed four rollers, each roller having 320 spokes in it, they are 6 feet long, viz: the rollers, and goes round upon a floor of 3 Inch plank of 7 feet long from the outer edge of the great circle and round the outer ends of the floor plank there is a thin plank upon it's edge and round the inner edge the same which keeps in the wheat. the Machine is drawn round by 4 Horses and beats out 100 Bushels of wheat every day. It was begun 1st instant.

Sunday, 28th. At home all day teaching Brooks.

Sunday, September 11th. D^o teaching Brooks. at 1 pm came M^r Kennedy from Fredericksburgh here to see me and after we had dined we ended the Quart of Rum I Bought 16th Last M^o.

Tuesday, October 4th. Went to Fredericksb^g and seed a Horse Race for a Hundred Guineas, Gained by M^r Fitchews Horse.³

¹ Presumably Alexander Spotswood of Newport, afterward brigadier-general; grandson of the famous governor.

² Mill's *Diary* shows, *passim*, how a Shetland minister of that day regarded the "Sabbath"; but it also shows that he could not induce all the islanders to observe it with the same strictness.

³ Sporting readers, if there are such among the votaries of history, will find the details of these days' races, derived from the pages of the *Virginia Gazette*, in Mr. W. G. Stanard's article already referred to, on Racing in Colonial Virginia, *Virginia Maga-*

Wednesday, 5th. This day a Horse race at Fredericksburg for Fifty pound, and it was gain'd by a Horse belonging to Col! Tailo.¹

Thursday, 6th. This day a Horse race at Fredericksburg for Fifty pound, and it was gained by a Horse belonging to M^r Fitchew.

Freiday, 7th. The race this day at Fredericksburg for Fifty pound was gained again by another Horse belonging to M^r Fitchew.

Saturday, 8th. This day the races at Fredericksburg was finished and this night finishes the Puppet shows, roape dancings &c, which has continowed every night this week in town. I only seed the purse of a Hundred Guineas run for, and that day I hade the Misfortune to have my Horse, saddle and bridle stole from me, while I was doing some business in town. And I never could hear, nor get any intelligence of either of them again.

Sunday, 23d. At church but there was no sermon only prayers. This day I carried home a Westcoat with a silver sprig through a strip'd white satine and Padasoy silk, which I had formerly bought made as it was being nothing worse than new for 8/6 Virginia Currancy, and a Brass Inkholder with a penknife in it bought at 1/6 C^r.²

Munday, 31st. This morning two Carpenters was put to new weather board my house on the outside with featherage plank, and to new plaster it on the Inside with shell lime.

Tuesday, November 1st. This day Col! William Daingerfield finished sowing his Wheat, having sown in all this year 160½ bushels. This day I eat extream good green Pease they being the second croap this season. In the afternoon they began to gather new corn and bro^t home 8 Ba^{lls} at night from 1000 Corn hills.

Sunday, 27th. This day at Church and heard Sermon by Mr. Muree³ his text was in Hebrews 13th Chap: and 18th verse. Bought a hanging lock for my Chest at 7½ Currancy.

Rec^d from Colonel Daingerfield New Coat and veastcoat of Claret couler'd Duffel.

Tuesday, December 6th. Wrote home.—3d Letter from Virginia.

zine, II. 293-305. The first day's race, "Jockey Club Plate," 100 guineas, open to members only, was won by Wm. Fitzhugh's Regulus, beating Alexander Spotswood's Eclipse, Mann Page's Damon, Wm. Brent's Figure, Wm. Fitzhugh's Master Stephen, and Moore Fauntleroy's Faithful Shepherdess. On the second day, a purse of £ 50, 4 mile heats, was won by John Tayloe's Single Peeper. On the third day the "Town Purse," 4 mile heats, was won by Wm. Fitzhugh's Kitty Fisher. On the fourth day the "Town and Country Purse," 4 mile heats, was won by William Fitzhugh's Volunteer. These were the last of the great races at Fredericksburg. The Revolution was impending, and there was a general sentiment to the effect that racing should stop.

¹ Col. John Tayloe of Mt. Airy in Richmond County. See AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, V. 307.

² Currency.

³ Rev. James Marye was rector of St. George's Parish from 1767 to 1780. He was the son of Rev. James Marye, the former rector, a Huguenot refugee.

BELVIDERA 6th Dec^r 1774.

My Dearest Life,

Since my arivil here I wrote you 14th June and 7th Aug^t last to both which I shall partly refer you. I now rite you with a shaking hand and a feeling heart to enqair of your and my D^r Infants welfare, this being the return of the day of the year on which I was obliged to leave you and my D^r Infants early in the morning which day will be ever remembred by me with tears untill it shall please God to grant us all a happy meeting again. I trust in the mercies of a good God this will find you and my D^r Infants in perfect health as I am and have been ever since I came here, for neither the heat in summer nor what I have as yet felt of the cold in winter gives me the least uneasiness I thank God for it. About 20 days ago I only laid aside my summer dress, and put on a suit of new Claret Coulerd Duffle neatly mounted but no lying in the Coat only faced in the breasts. I wrote you in my first letter, that I was designed Please God to prepare a way for you and my Infants in this Country; And I begg youll give me your thoughts fully upon it, in your first letter after receipt of this with respect to your moving here. If you do your method must be thus; Take your Passage to Leith, from thence go to Glasgow and from that to Greenock where you will ship for this country. But this you are not to attemp untill I have your thoughts upon it and I send you a recomendation to a Merch^t in Glasgow and cash to bear your expences. I have as yet only ten scollars One of which is both Deaff and Dumb and his Father pays me ten shilling per Quarter for him he has been now five M^{rs} with [me] and I have brought him tolerably well and understands it so far, that he can write mostly for anything he wants and understands the value of every figure and can work single addition a little. he is about fourteen years of age.¹ Another of them is a young man a house Carpenter who attends me every night with candle light and every Sunday that I don't go to Church for which he pays me fourty shillings a year. He is Carpenter for a gentleman who lives two miles from me and has Thirty pound a year, free bedd and board.

The Col^{ls} Children comes on pretty well. the Eldest is now reading verry distinctly in the Psalter according to the Church of England and the other two boys ready to enter into it; the Col^l and his Lady being extremely well satisfied w^t my Conduct in every respect; On 31st Jully last M^{rs} Daingerfield was deliv^d of a fourth son who is now my nameson. I am now verry impatient to hear from you and I [beg] of you not to slip a Packqut without writting me, Accord to the directions I formerly sent you which I shall again repeat in this for fear of my former letters being miscarried which I hope not; The next time [I] write you I hope to be able to make you a small remittance.

¹The entries under March 18 and May 20, 1775, seem to indicate that the experiment did not proceed beyond the date of this letter.

I would have at this time wrote your Brother M^r. Craigie,¹ for I truly belive his private good wishes to me was always sincere, But I want to hear from you first by which I hope to learn how every one's pulse in your place beats towards me and his among the rest, which I hope you'll not fail to take notice of.—I now as far as my sheet of paper will allow me, for your Amusements and information, shall write you some of the news of this Western World, and first with respect to myself. Know that I have not drunk a dish of Tea this six M^{rs}. past, nor have I drunk a dram of plain spirits this seven M^{rs}. past, nor have I tasted broth or any kind of supping mate for the above time unless three or four times some soup ; Notwithstanding I want for nothing that I cou'd desire, and am only affraid of getting fatt, tho we seldom eat here but twice a day. for Breackfast we have always Coffie with plenty of warm loaf bread and fine butter. at 12 oClock when I leave school, I have as much good rum toddie as I chuse to drink, and for Dinner we have plenty of roast and boyled and good strong beer, but seldom eat any supper. There has been a hote War here this last summer betwixt the fronteer Countys of this Collony and the united tribes of the Shawanese, Deleware, Mingo and Tawa Indians settled on the otherside of the Banks of the Ohio. On Munday morning 10th Oct^r last a Deccisive Battle was fought at the mouth of the great Canhawa² Betwixt 150 of Augusta County troops under the Command of Col^l. Cha^s. Lewis 800 of the troops belonging to Botitourt, Bedford and Fincastle County, under the Command of Col^l. Fleming and Col^l. Field ; The Battle began half an hour after sun up and continowed verry hot until after noon, when the above Indians being above 800 in number were put to flight. In this Action were killed the above Col^l. Cha^s. Lewis and Col^l. Field, Four Captains three subalterns and 44 private men. Col. Fleming was wounded three Captains four subalterns and 79 private men. The same evening after the Battle an express araved at the Camp from Lord John Dunmore Governour of Virginia for this Division of the Army to Joyne him, he being then 75 Miles further up the Ohio on the Indian side with 600 more of the troops belonging to the foresaid Countys, he then knowing nothing of the Battle. Next day this part of the Army decamp'd and when they hade Joyn'd His Lod^g. All the Army march'd foreward in order to Burn and destroy the whole Indian Touns ; But when they were within three Miles of them, The Indians came out naked as they were born and Begged for Mercy and peace, they having lost above double the number of men that we did in the late engagement. Accordingly peace was granted them on the following terms Viz^t 1st. They are to deliver up all the white prisoners they have, next they are to deliver up somany of their principall men of each nation, to be kept as hostages for their good behaviour in time to come, lastly they are to

¹ Mrs. Harrower's brother, Captain James Craigie, to whom a letter printed later is addressed, was a leading merchant of Lerwick. In the "Annals of the County of Zetland," referred to in the introduction, *supra*, he appears as appointed in 1763 to be overseer and superintendent of the building of the new tolbooth. In 1766, however, he is permitted to resign, his health having recently become impaired.

² The celebrated battle of Point Pleasant.

pay the whole expence of the war in land at three pound per M Acres. So much for Indian news.

You no doubt have heard of the present disturb^s. Betwixt Great Britain and the Collonys in N. America, Owing to severall Acts of Parliment lately made greatly infringing the rights and Liberties of the Americans, and in order to enforce these Acts, The Harbour and Toun of Boston are at present blockt up by a fleet and armie under the Command of Gen^l Gage. The Americans are determined to Act with Caution and prudence in this affair, and at same time are resolved not to lose an inch of their rights or liberties, nor to submit to these Acts. And in order to enforce a repeal of them, A Generall Congress was held at Philadelphia by Delegates from the following Provinces Viz^t. New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rode Island and Providence Plantations, Connicticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, The Countys of Newcastle, Kent, and Sussex on Delewar, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina. The Delegates were chosen from the Houses of Burges of each of the above Collonys and met on the 5th Sept^r last and continued sitting untill the last of Oct^r And it is resolved that they will allow no goods to be imported into America from Great Britain, Ireland, or any of the Islands thereto belonging aⁿ the 1st Ins^t Nor will they export from America to Great Britain or Ireland or any of the Islands thereto belonging any goods after the 1st Dec^r 1775 during which time any that are indebted to Great Britain may pay up their ballances. Ma[n]y and pretty are the resolves of August Assembly, but room wou'd fail me here to insert them. By the Congress the Bostonians are desired not to leave the Toun nor to give any offence to Gen^l Gage or the troops under his Command, But if he or they offers to commit the least Hostielyties in order to enforce any to the Obedience of these Acts, they are to repel force by force and the Bostonians can raise in their Collony in 24 Hours warning ods of 60 M men well disiplined and all readdy provided w^t arms and amunition. And the resolves of the Congress every one of the above Collonys and each man in every Collony are determined to abide by. And it is my oppinion that the laboring part and poor of Boston are as well supplied at present by controbutions sent free to them from the other Collonys as when their trade was oppen. M^r Daingerfield this year for his own hand gives them fifty Bushels of wheat and One Hundred Bushels of Indian Corn, By which ye may Judge of the rest.¹

The 19th August last, M^r Daingerfield finished his wheat hearvest and began to plow and sow wheat again for the next crop 22 said M^r and after sowing 260 Bushels finished it the 1st of Nov^r. they are now gathering Indian Corn of which he will have better than 4000 bushels 3000 of which he will Use for his Nigers and horses, the rest for sale ; so much for American and Plantation news the Veracity of which you may depend upon and may show the same to any of your freinds or well wishers.

¹ There is on record at the Virginia State Library a list of contributors to this supply of the Bostonians. It embraces the names of many well-known men of the day, and the gifts range from one barrel of corn up.

Your directions for me is to Jn^o Harrower at the seat of Col^l Will^m Daingerfield Esq^r of Belvidera near Fredericksburgh Rappahannock River Virginia, and then inclose it in a letter to Mess^{rs} Anderson and Horseburgh Merch^{ts} in Glasgow and desire them to foreward the same under Cover to M^r John Glassel Mer^t in Fredericksb^g their Correspondent who will pay all charges for my acco^t.—Pray my Dearest let me know what my D^r Boys and Girle are doing. I hope Jock¹ and George are still at school and I begg of you to strain every nerve to keep them at it untill I am able to assist you, for he who has got education will always gain Bread and to spare, and that in a genteel way in some place or other of the World. I suppose Betts is at home with yourself, but pray keep her tight to her seam and stockin and any other Housold affairs that her years are capable of and do not bring her up to Idleness or play or going about from house to house which is the first inlet in any of the sex to laziness and vice. Send me an Acco^t of their Ages from the Bible which ye may do verry short by saying Jo: Born — day Nov. 1762 Geo: Born &^{ca}

I yet hope please God, if I am spared, some time to make you a Virginian Lady among the woods of America which is by far more pleasant than the roaring of the raging seas round abo't Zetland, And yet to make you eat more wheat Bread in your old age than what you have done in your Youth. But this I must do by carefullness, industry and a Close Application to Business, which ye may take notice of in this letter I am doing Sunday as well as Saturday nor will I slip an honest method nor an hour whereby I can gain a penny for yours and my own advantage.

There grows here plenty of extream fine Cotton which after being pict clean and readdy for the cards is sold at a shilling the pound; and I have at this time a great high Girl Carline as Black as the . . . spinning some for me for which I must pay her three shillings the pound for spinning it for she must do it on nights or on Sunday for any thing I know notwithstanding she's the Millers wife on the next plantation. But Im determined to have a webb of Cotton Cloath According to my own mind, of which I hope you and my infants shall yet wear apart; I cou'd write to you for a week for it gives me pleaser while I am writting to you, But as room fails me I must conclude with offering my good wishes to your Broth^r, M^r and M^{rs} Vance,² M^r and M^{rs} Forbes³ and M^r Ferguson⁴ if deserving at your hand with my Comp^{ts} to all who asks for me. And my

¹ In 1810 a J. Harrower, Caledonia Lodge of Masons, Edinburgh, affiliated at Lodge Morton, Lerwick, and he was appointed Proxy Master of the latter in 1815. This may have been our Harrower's son.

² James Vance seems to have been one of the most prominent and most esteemed men in Lerwick. He was land-waiter and postmaster for the government, and the kirk sessions records show him as precentor, and afterward as session clerk, kirk treasurer and elder. He was warmly interested in the promotion of education and other good works. His wife was Barbara Craigie, sister of Mrs. Harrower, and of Captain James Craigie.

³ See note 2, on p. 84, *supra*.

⁴ William Ferguson was married to Ann Ross, sister of Margaret Ross, wife of James Craigie. He was supervisor of excise at Lerwick, and was a native of Thurso in Caithness.

sinceer prayers to God for you and my D^r Children and belive me to be ever while I have breath, My Dearest Jewell, your Aff^o husb^d till death. Signed J. H. Addressed To M^{rs} John Harrower in Lerwick Zetland By Edinburgh, North Britain.

Saturday, 10th. This day after 12 Oclock rode to Town and deliv^d my letter dated 6th Ins^t to M^r John Glassell to be forewarded to Britain per first ship. Bought 1 PadLock at 1/ Curr^r and 1 Dozⁿ Vest buttons silver plated at 1/ Curr^r and pocket expence 9^d Curr^r.

Wednesday, 14th. This day M^r Daingerfield hade 35 Hogs Killed weighting at an average about 150 lb. and they are to serve for salt Beacon untill the return of next year this time. all the Hams and Shoulders are cured with salt peter. Sold $\frac{1}{2}$ dozⁿ horn Buttons at 3 $\frac{3}{4}$.

Tuesday, 20th. last night I dreamt that my wife came to me here, and told me she had sent Johnnie and Bettie to Deall¹ to stay and left George in the house with M. J. the servant.

Sunday, 25th. Christmas day, stayed at home all day along w^t the Overseer and Childreen because I hade no saddle to go to the Church with. In the morning the Col^l Ordred up to school two Bottles of the best Rum and some suggar for me.

Munday, 26th. This forenoon the Col^l wou^d have me to take his saddle and ride to Toun and Amuse myself, and when I was going gave me Six Shillings for pocket money. I went to Toun and Dined in a private house and after buying 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ Dozⁿ Mother of Pearle buttons for my white morsyld Vest I return^d home in the evening.

Tuesday, 27th. St. Johns day. This day² a Grand Lodge in Toun, And the whole went to Church in their Clothing and heard sermon.

Thursday, 29th. I began to keep school.

Freiday, 30th. This day there was severall Gentlemen from Fredericksburgh here at Dinner with whom I dined.

Tuesday, January 10th, 1775. This day Tho^s Brooks who has at-ten[d]ed ever night and on Sundays left school being obliged to go 40 miles up the country to work. at same time he gave me an order on Col^l Daingerfield for £1. 10. 8. Curr^r of which £1. 5. 2 was for teaching him.

Saturday, 21st. Some time ago I having got a present of piece of Lead coul^d Cloath from Miss Lucy Gaines³ I got made in a Vest by Kid-beck the Taylor for which I have this day paid him 3/ 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ Cur^r.

Sunday, 22nd. This day at Church in Town and heard M^r Marec preach Text 2^d Cor^s 4 Chap: and 18th Verse.

Tuesday, 31st. 1 pm yesterday Ja^s and W^m Porters, sons of M^r William Porter Merch^t in Fredericksb^g came here to School.

Tuesday, February 14th. This day the Col^l on finding more wheat left among the straw then should be blamed M^r Lewis the Overseer for

¹ A village on the mainland of Scotland, in Caithness, about ten miles south of Thurso. Harrower may have come from there or had relatives living there.

² Always a day of especial festivity at Fredericksburg, ending in a ball at the Sun Rise tavern.

³ The housekeeper.

his carelessness, upon which M^r Lewis seem'd verry much enraged for being spoke to and verry sawcily threw up all the keys he hade in charge and went off; upon which the Col^l sent for me and delivered me the keys of the Barn and begged I would assist him in his business untill he got another Overseer.

[*Wednesday*], 15th. This morning the Col^l sent to scholl for me, and begg'd me to go to Snowcreek Barn and deliver the wheat that was there first to the Vessel who was come to receive the whole of it. She was a schooner of 120 Tun M^{rs} name Jn^o Lurtey.

Tuesday, 21st. Empl^d as Yesterday. This day the Col^l engaged a young man for an Overseer Whose name is Anthony Fraser.

Thursday, 23^d. This day finised trading out wheat, also deliv^d the last of it having delivered One thousand five hundred Bushels and 240 Bushels formerly deliv^d by M^r Lewis which with 260 Bushels sown makes 2000 Bushels besides serving the Famely and some bushels sold to people who works on the plantation.

Munday, 27th. This day M^r Fraser came here and entred to take his charge as Overseer, and he is to have his bed in the school along with me. he appears to be a verry quiet young man and has hade a tolerable education. his Grandfather came from Scotland.

Saturday, *March* 18th. Last night a verry keen frost so that all the fruit that is blossom'd is in danger of being killed by it. Same day I wrote M^r Samuel Edge the following letter Viz^t

Sir

When I hade the pleasure of seeing [you] on the 4th Feb^y last at your howse you then told me you was to be in Town the week after, and proposed calling here in your way home, in order to pay me the twenty shillings as agreed on; but since have heard nothing from you. Nothing but the real necessity for some books (which I greatly want) Oblidges me now to trouble you with this, hopping if it is any ways convenient for you, that you will send the cash per the bearer (and if required) how soon time will permit me to see you shall give you an ample discharge. My compliments to yourself M^{rs} Edge and Miss Sally and am &c^a

Saturday, 25th. At noon went to Newport to see M^r Martin Heely schoolmaster to M^r Spotswood's Children, and after Dinner I spent the afternoon with him in conversation and hearing him play the Fiddle. He also made a Niger come and play on an Instrument call'd a Barrafou. The body of it is an oblong box with the mouth up and stands on four sticks put in bottom, and cross the [top] is laid 11 lose sticks upon [which] he beats.

Sunday, 26th. 9 AM Set out on horseback for Mount Church¹ in Caroline County in Company with M^r Richards, M^{rs} Richards, M^r Martin Heely, M^r Anthony Frazer and Miss Lucy Gaines. And heard M^r Waugh preach his text being the 1st V. of the 12th Chapter of Ecclesias-

¹For Mount Church, in St. Mary's parish, see Bishop Meade's *Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia*, I. 410-412. Rev. Abner Waugh was the incumbent of the parish, having recently succeeded the more famous Rev. Jonathan Boucher.

tes. After which we all returned to M^r Richards before 3 pm where we dined and spent the afternoon. From Belvidera to Mount Church is 10 Miles.

Saturday, April 1st. At 6 pm M^r Martin Heely schoolmaster at Newport for M^r Spotswoods Children came here to pay me a Visite and staid with me all night.

Sunday, 9th. This day a good number of Company dined here among which was M^r and M^{rs} Porter from Town, who heard their eldest son read and seemed verry well pleased with his performance since he came to me ; Myself at home all day.

Freiday, 14th. This being good Freiday, I broke up school for Easter Holly day, and the Col^{ls} three sons went to Town with M^r Porter's two sons this forenoon I went a money hunting but catc'd none.

Saturday, 15th. This forenoon I went a Money Hunting again an other way but hade no better success then yesterday. This afternoon M^r Frazer went up the Country to see his Mother and friends, and I give out corn for him, untill he returns again.

Munday, 17th. At 8 AM I rode to Town in order to see the boys and Amuse myself fore some hours. On my Aravel in Town the first thing I got to do was to dictate and write a love letter from M^r Anderson, to one Peggie Dewar at the Howse of M^r John Mitchel at the Wilderness. After that I went to M^r John Glassell's store to enquire for letters from home but found none ; here I mett with the Col^l who gave me two pair brown thread stockins for my summers wear. At 2 pm I dined with him in M^r Porters, and soon after Returned home.

Thursday, 20th. This morning all the boys came to school again at their Usual hour. On tuesday last was missed out of the pasture a breeding mare. search being made fore her by the Overseer he found this afternoon the Neiger fellow who hade rode her off and after riding her about 24 Miles from the Plantation turned her loose in the high road. he is a Blacksmith by trade and belongs to and works at a Plantation of M^r Corbins,¹ and after he had confessed the fact M^r Frazer ower Overseer stript him to the [skin] and gave him 39 laches with Hickry switches that being the highest the Law allows at one Wheeping.

Munday, 24th. This morning the Col^l began to have his Indian Corn planted which they do in following maner Viz^t The plowers plow three furrows close together from one end of the field to the other, the midle furrow of each three being 6 feet distance from the middle of the next three and so on from the one side of the field to the other, Then they run one furrow across the field and at 6 feet distance another and so on in streight lines from the one end of the field to the other which leaves the whole field like a dambrod² then the Neigers drop the corn in every square and at the same time with a stock of their How cover [them]. the grown betwixt the furrow are brocke up Afterw^{ds} at Liesure with the Ploughs without any Damage to the corne. But the best method is when the ploughs is lay off the ground withe one furrow a Neiger

¹ To whom Harrower was afterward overseer.

² Checker-board.

ought to follow every Plough drop the corn and immediatly cover it up. Some are now done planting of corn. last night Mr. Frazer found the Mare that was rode off and brought her home.

Freiday, 28th. This day by an express from Boston we are informed of an engagement betwixt the British troops and the Bostonians, in which the former were repuls'd with loss, but no particulars as yet.

Saturday, 29th. This day there was at Fredricksburgh about 600 men under Arms composed of the independant companys of severall Counties. they designed to have Marched to Williamsburg and to have made the Governor deliver back some powder he caused to be Clandestinely carried off, but was prevented by an express from the speaker with advice that the Governor was ready to give it up on ten minutes warning.¹

Wednesday, May 3d. This day the Col^l bought and rec^d ten bushels of Span^s Salt for ten bushels Indian Corn. at noon the Col^{ls} Nigers finised planting Indian Corn having planted about 300 Acres of land, which took about 25 Bushels of seed.

Saturday, 6th. This afternoon I planted 41 hills of grownd with Cotton seed.

Sunday, 7th. At 2 houses this day seeking money that was owing me but got none.

Munday, 8th. This morning I planted 22 Hills of grownd with Water Mellon and Mush Mellon Seed. This afternoon I eat ripe strawberries.

Saturday, 20th. This day I wrote the following letter to Sam^l Edge for Twenty shillings that has been due me since the 25th Nov^r 1774.

Mr. Samuel Edge

Sir—I wrote you 18th March last requesting you then to send me per the Bearer then sent, the twenty shillings you are indebted to me, which money you promised to have paid a Month before that time. Notwithstanding of which I have neither seen nor heard from you since, which to me appear some what Strange.

On Saturday last I was informed you intended to send me a wild Goose hunting by giving me a Draught on another. But if any one is owing you I do not chuse to demand the debt ; Therefore I hereby aquant you that I will not accept a draught upon none ; Therefore I am hopefull you will now send the money by the bearer hereof as I really have pressing occassion for it and cannot be longer without it, having neither stock nor store here to receive money with to purchase what I really cannot be without. your compliance to the above will greatly oblige and wherein I can serve you may freely command Sir yours &^{ca}

Signed J H

Addressed To Mr. Samuel Edge, Overseer.

This afternoon I was invited to a Gentlemans house in order to eat plenty of ripe Cherries.

¹ See Henry's *Patrick Henry*, I. 277-279; Sparks's *Washington*, II. 507-509.

Sunday, 21st. This day I hade sent me a present from M^{rs} Porter in Fred^s two silk Vestcoats and two pair cotton britches all of them having been but verry little wore by M^r Porter.

Saturday, 27th. This afternoon I rode to Town and bought at M^r Porters Store 2 handkerchiefs and one Yd Bedd Tyke¹ at 2/2d Curr^y being all 5/2d. Curr^y. At same time rec^d a letter from my Wife dated 1st March 1775. It came under cover to M^r John Glassell Merch^t in Toun and cost me 1/3d Curr^y. At same time rec^d from Tho^s Anderson a pair of new Shoes on the Col^{ls} Acco^t.

Saturday, June 3^d. At 9 AM M^r Porter's two son's was sent for and they went to Toun to keep Whitsuntide holliday.

Wednesday, 7th. Began to keep school again.

Freiday, 16th. This day at 9 AM Col^o Daingerfield set out for his Q^y down the Country at Chickahommanie to receive his Cash for the last years produce of said plantation from John Miller his Overseer there.

Sunday, 18th. This day at 10 AM went to John Pattie's and rec^d 6/ for teaching his William $\frac{1}{4}$ of a year and from [thence] to Thomas Evans's and rec^d 20/ for teaching his Daught^r Sarah for One Year.

Saturday, July 1st. At noon I went to Frederick^s and bought 15 bigg Double Guilt buttons at 4/9 One hank silk twist at 1/ and one ounce brown thread at 6d. my pocket expence this day 1/. I returned home an houre before sun down.

Freiday, 7th. This day at sunset Col^o Daingerfield finished cutting down 260 Bushels sowing of wheat in fifteen days with seven Cradlers and it was done in 6 days less time than 203 bushels sowing was last Harvest and with fewer hands. For this Harvest his money payments to Out labourers is reduced no less than £18.4. 6d. lower than it was last and at same time the Wheat better put up all which is chiefly owing to the Activity of Anthony Frazer the present Overseer.

Saturday 8th. This moring began to bring Wheat to the Barn with two Carts Six Oxen in the One and three Horses in the Other.

Sunday, 16th. This day I went to Church in Toun and heard sermon preached by one M^r Murray his text was Math: 6th and 24th V. I was no pocket expence this day.

Wednesday, 19th. This day I was Informed that M^{rs} Daingerfield hade made a Complaint upon me to the Col^o for not waiting after Breackfast and dinner (sometimes) in order to take the Children along with me to scholl; I imagine she has a grudge against me since the middle of Feb^y last the reason was, that one night in the Nursery I wheep'd Billie for crying for nothing and she came in and carried him out from me. Some nights after he got into the same humour and his Papa The Col^o hearing him call'd me and Asked why I cou'd hear him do so and not correct him for it; Upon that I told him how M^{rs} Daingerfield had behaved when I did correct him. At that he was angry w^t her.

¹ Bed-tick.

Saturday, 22d. On Saturd^e 13 Ins^t some words happned betwixt John M^cDearmand and the Col^o about John's not being expedecious enough About stacking and requiring too many hands to attend him upon which John left the work immedeatly and has not returned since. And by the Acco^{ts} in my hands I find the Col^o is in Johns debt £9.10.9 Virg^a Currancy.

Sunday, 23d. M^rs Porter having been here all night from Town ; I this day after breackfast brought all the boys with their books into the passage to the Col^o who heard each of them read and was highly pleased with their performance. M^rs Porter likeways told that her sons did me great honour ; as well as the rest.

Wednesday, 26th. This day at noon was finished the bringing hom and stacking the Col^{os} Wheat having 18 Stacks of 100 Bushels each by Computation besides a Large Barn fill'd up to the roof. It was brought home this year in 15 days less time than it was last year. I this day ate Watermelon of my own planting it being the first I ate this season.

Wednesday, August 2d. Yesterday the Col^o Began to Sow Wheat for the ensewing croop. This day came to School W^m John and Lucy Patties, and are to pay conform to the time they Attend. expecting a Visit of M^r Kenedy sent to Town for a bottle of Vest India Rum which cost me 1/3 Currancy.

Tuesday, 22d. This morning the Col^o began to trade out wheat in the Yard with horses which is done in the following manner Viz^t. They take wheat from the stack and spreads it about eight foot broad in a large circle, and with as many horses as they have they ride upon it round and round and 3 or 4 men keep always turning and stirring it up, and by this method they with 10 or 12 horses will trade out 100 Bushels in a day. where they trade Just now is 300 feet Circumference.

Munday, 28th. Coppy of my 4th Letter wrote this day to my wife.
My Dearest Life

Your most agreeable favours I rec^d 27th May last, which was dated 1st March, And you may belive me it gave me the greatest satisfaction I have hade for twelve months past to hear from your own hand that you my Dearest Jewell and my sweet Infants are and has been in a good state of health since I left you, As I still am and has been for the above time, For which we have all great reason to render all due praise to that ever Glorious Being who wisely governs and directs all our Accions ; And may he for the sake of him who suffered on the Cross for all sinners continoue to protect and direct you and all that conserns us for the better. I would have wrote you sooner after the receipt of yours, had I not been waiting an Answer to a verry long letter I wrote 6th Dec^r last which I find had not come to your hand when you wrote me but am hopefull it has long before now and an Answer to it on its way here. When you write me I intreat you to do it on a sheet of the largest post paper you can get and leave no waste room in it, as the postage is no more than if it was three lines on $\frac{1}{4}$ sheet. And sure I am you can find subject enough to fill a sheet of paper as you well know that

whatever comes from your hand must be agreeable. I am extreemly glad to hear you are Chiefly directed by your Broth^r Cap^t Craigie and I think myself highly obliged to him both for his advice and assistance to you in my absence, I having of this date wrote him myself and given him my most hearty thanks for his good offices to you and begged his continouance of the same.

I begg you to advise with your Brother on that paragraph of my last letter with respect to your moving here, and I have likeways now begged him to write me his thoughts on the same subject, so that I expect you will both write me fully on receipt of this, and I begg you to put him in mind of it. I have also wrote him to be assisting to you, untill such time as the ports are oppen for trade betwixt Britain and the Collonies and the disputes made up betwixt them, for untill that is done there is no such thing as remitting money or goods from any part of America to Britain, which gives me a good deall of trouble on your Acc^t of which your Broth^r can more fully inform you of, As also of the engagements that has been betwixt the British troops and the forces of the united Collonies before Boston as room wou'd faill me here to do it. As to M^r Forbes pray make my Compt^s to him and spouse and tell him from me that I make no doubt from the information I have of his making good bread in this Country for that a Journaman Bricklayer here has no less than five shillings a day Currancy which is equall to four Shillings St^l. And I am aquanted with an Undertaker in that branch of business who is now set down on good Estate and rides in his Chair every day. But if he was to come over he must resolve to give closs application to business and keep from drinking. About 7 months ago a Gentleman in Fredericksb^g hade his two sons taken from the high school there and put under my care for which he pays me £5 a year. He is an English man himself and his Lady from Edinburgh,¹ and I have the pleasure to have given the parents such satisfaction that I hade sent me in a present two silk vest-coats and two pair of britches ready to put on for changes in summer. I observe my Dear Dogg George writes me his name at the foot of your letter, But I am surprized that you take no notice of Jack and Bettie. But I hope you will not faill to be more particular about them in your next, and give my blessing to them all and tell them from me that I hope they will be obedient to you in every respect and mind their books. Before I get things brought to a bearing was any vessell by chance to put into Bressaysound² bound for any part of Virginia or for Pawtomack river which divides this Collony from Maryland, I wou'd have you at all events Make your Brother apply for your Passage with the Children and a servant and immediatly dispose of every article in the house your Feather Bedds Bedding and Cloaths excepted, and if any money to spare lay it out in Linen;³ and write me immediatly on your Aravell here by post

¹ Mr. and Mrs. Porter.

² The harbor of Lerwick.

³ Linen was one of the chief articles of domestic manufacture and export from Shetland in the eighteenth century.

and I shou'd soon be with you. May God grant that such a cast may happen to you. I must now conclude by offering my Compt^s to M^r and M^{rs} Vance, and all who enquires for me in a friendly way, with my blessing to you my sweet life and my Dear Infants is all at present from, My Dearest Jewell, your ever affectionate Husband while—Signed J. H.

Belvidera 28th Aug^t 1775. Addressed to M^{rs} John Harrower in Lerwick, Zetland, by Edinburgh, North Britain.

Same date. A Coppy.

D^r Sir

I make no doubt but by my not laying my mind open to you sooner I have partly incur'd your displeasure, But before I am done shall hope for your excusing me, And allow me to take this opportunity of returning you my most gratefull Acknowledgements for your good advice and Assistance to my Dearest Wife and Children since we have been absent from one another, and I earnestly intreat your continuance of the same and am hopefull you will not see her in strait untill I am able to repay you, and wherin I can serve you or yours it shall never be wanting on my part. My design of leaving Zetland for some time was only known to my wife; And the making it known to any person else wou'd not in all probabilitie wou'd not have hindred it; I being so straitned that nothing but money upon Intrest for some Considerable time cou'd have saved me from being personally exposed; But when I left the Country, I did not intend going further than Holland, or even London cou'd I have found business there to my liking but not finding that, and the frost being strong in Holland, I was determin'd to see what I cou'd do in this Western World. And as to my business and situation here, Annie can fully inform you if she has not already done it. Here I have kept my health much better than ever I did before in any place, and am as happily situated as I cou'd wish had I my wife and Children with me, Only not in a way at present to make much money, tho I hope in a short time I shall be able to make more; I have now wrote Annie to advise with you with respect to her moving to this Country with the Children, and shall expect her thoughts upon it in her next; And I earnestly begg of you that on receipt of this you take the trouble to write me yourself and give me your mind on the same subject, likeways let me know how trade goes with any thing else that is remarcable in the country, And Annie will give you the proper directions for me.

Untill the disputes betwixt Government and the Collonies are settled there is no such thing as getting any remittance made to any part in Britain; Hostilities being already begun at Boston and three Engagements already fought betwixt the British troops and the provincials the last of which on the 17th June last at Charleston near Boston, when the Provincials gained the day as they did of the other two. In this last Eng^t Gen^l Gage hade above a thousand men left dead on the field of Battle and 500 wounded. Among the dead are many of the British offi-

cers, which is owing to the Americans taking sight when they fire, An instance of w^h I shall here give you. Col^o Washington of this Collony being appointed Generalissimo of all the American Forces raised and to be raised, made a demand of 500 Rifflemen from the fronteers of this Coll^y. But those that insisted on going far exceeded the number wanted when in order to avoid giving offence, The commanding Officer chuse his Comp^y by the following method Viz^t He took a board of a foot squar and w^h Chalk drew the shape of a moderate nose in the center and nailed it up to a tree at 150 yd^s distance and those who came nighest the mark with a single ball was to go. But by the first 40 or 50 that fired the nose was all blown out of the board, and by the time his Comp^y was up the board shared the same fate. How or when these differences will [end] God only knows, But the Americans are determined to stand by one another to the last man and all exports and imports are intirely stopt also planting of Tobacco. On 26th last M^o wheat Harvest was finised on this Plantation by getting the last of it brought home and stacked, the Amount of which will be about 3 thousand bushells, and now ten ploughs are at work every day ploughing wheat into the ground again for the next croop. It is sown here in the same field where the Indian corn is growing, so that both grow together untill the M^o of Nov^r when the corn is gathered and the field cleared of the stalks. Indian corn is planted at six feet distance each way as streight and regular as you do Cabbage in a garden and when it is sprung up only two stalks left in a hill ; It will grow from five to twelve or fourteen high and each stalk will have two if not three Ears on it and each Ear will have from five to Eight hundred grains on it, the size of which you know. But from Ap^l the time it is planted untill now that the wheat is sown among it, It is kept as clean of grass and weeds as a garden by the Ploughs running continually betwixt the rows first the one way and then the other, and the Howers going round the hills with their hows, and without this work it wou'd come to no perfection. Of Corn there will be on this Plantation about 8 or 9 Hundred Barrells at five Bushells to the Barrell, about 350 Barrell will be used for the Nigers and Horses, the rest for sale, the price about 10/ per B^l. As for what the White ates of it is but triffling for three Barrell of Corn is rather more than any one Man can use in a year let him ate no other bread, the value of which is only 30/. All the white people on the Plantation is the Col^o, his Lady, five Children, a Housekeeper an Overseer and myself, But I think no more now of seeing 40 or 50 Nigers every day, than I did of seeing so many [Dabling ?]wifes at Johnsmiss¹ with single stockins, two or three of the best of which if I hade here I cou'd sell to Good Acco^t. On casting my Eye out of the window I cannot help most heartily wishing you hade some of the most Charming Water-mellons I have now growing and some of them ripe within less 3 Yd^s of where I sitt. Some of which will weigh from 20 to 30 lb. My Plan-tation for my Amusement consists of the following Articles Viz^t Water

¹ St. John's Day.

melons, mushmelons, Cucumbers, Pumpkins, Gourds spanish Pitatoes and Cotton. So much for Plantation information.

I am truly affraid I have incroached on your patience already in giving you the trouble of reading this long epistle therefore I shall conclude at this time by earnestly entreating you to write me at Large and let me know your thoughts on the present disputes betwixt the Collonies and the Ministry. My Compt^s to M^{rs} Craigie Miss Peggy and your two sons to M^r and M^{rs} Sands¹ and their children and please accept of the same yourself from him who is with sinceer regaird D^r S^r your Most Aff^t Broth^r and Hu^t Serv^t J. H^t

Belvidera 28th August 1775. Addressed to Cap^t James Craigie in Lerwick, Zetland, by Edinburgh, North Britain.

Saturday, September 2d. At noon rode to Town and delivered two letters to Mr. Henry Mitchell, One for my wife and one for her Brother Cap^t James Craigie After which I retur^d home by sundown.

Wednesday, 6th. This day I was informed by M^r Frazer that M^{rs} Daingerfield talking to them of me that morning about some Glue disrespectfully calld me Old Harrower by which and her behaveiour to myself I find her grudge continous tho she has not courage to say any thing to myself well knowing she has [no] foundation to go upon.

Sunday, 10th. This day came Dick a Serv^t belonging to M^r Anderson from Toun and a Comerade of his to see me and Brought me a pair new shoes and a pair for M^r Frazer also a Bottle Vest India Rum which we drank in school in Company with M^r Frazer.

Munday, 11th. This day sent my letter to wife to Fredericksb^{rg} by M^r Frazer and gave him 1/6 to give with it at the post office as Postage to New York. But M^r Brown my friend the Clark told M^r Frazer he wou^d send it home free for me by a Ship going to saile.

Friday, 15th. Wrote my 5th Letter this day from Virginia, This being the Copy.

My Dearest Life, Yours of the 12th May last I received 2^d Ins^t immediately after sending off one for you and one for your Aff^l brother dated 28th last M^{rs} Both which will come to your Hand I imagine at the same time that this will as I am oblidged to send this to New York by post in order to come to London by the Pacquet, There being no more Opportunities from this Collony to Glasgow this season, by reason that the Nonimportation and Nonexportation Acts of the Continental Congress now takes place and will continue untill the disputes betwixt Great Britain and the Colonys be settled. And I intreat you immediately on receipt of this letter to wait on your Brother and show it to him, and he will more fully inform you of these Matters than room will permit me to do here, As my principal Design of writing you this so soon after my last is to make you as easy as possible I can, both with respect to my not sending for you and making you a remittance. As to the first of these I cou^d not be certain if you wou^d come to this Country or not untill I

¹ Rev. James Sands was the minister of Lerwick.

rec^d. your last letter. But as I find by it you are satisfied to come here, you may believe me nothing in this world can give me equall satisfaction to my having you and my D^r Infants with me. As a proof of which I have ever signified the same in my letters to your brother. And I now declare unto you as I sincerely write from my heart before God, that I will how soon I am able point out the way to you how you may get here, and at same time make you what remittance I can in order to Assist you on your way. But you must consider that as I had not a shilling in my pocket when I left you It must take me some time before I can be able to make you a remittance. Therefore I even pray you for Gods sake to have patience and keep up your heart and no means let that fail you: For be assured the time is not Longer to you than me, And the National disputes and the stoppage of trade betwixt this and the Mother Country if not soon settled will of course make the time longer as your bro^r will inform you. As to your Jocks upon me with respect to my getting a Virginian Lady it is the least in all my thoughts and am determined to leave that Jobb for you by aiding your sons with your advice to them in their choise of wifes among the Virginian Ladys: For I am resolved (as at first) to do as much for you as God is pleased to put in my power.

I am glad you are moved to a place of the Toun, as you say agreeable to your own disposition, but am extreemly fearfull for you on Acco^t of the earthen floor: And considering Forbes behaviour to you, what I wrote you in my last concerning him you have prudence enough to keep it to yourself, and I will give myself no further trouble here about him. I am verry uneasy about your being so tender this spring But am hopefull you have quite got the better of it before now. At same time it gives me great satisfaction to hear the Children are all well, and that Jock is still at Walls.¹ I hope he is now making some progress in his Education, and am hopefull George will do the same. As for Betts Im not afraid of her considering whose hands she is under. I have nothing further to add at present only I again begg of you to keep a good heart and do the best you can untill it please God to enable me to assist you and for aught I think you shall hear no more from me untill I be able to remitt you either more or less.

My Compliments and sincere good wishes to your Brother M^r Craigie, his spouse and Family likeways my Comp^{ts} to M^r and M^{rs} Vance, and all others wh may enquire for me in a friendly way; with my sincere love and prayers to God for you my Dearest Jewell and Children is all at present from your ever Aff^{ct} Husb^d signed J. H. Belvidera 15th Sept^r 1775. Addressed To M^{rs} John Harrower in Lerwick Zetland by the New York Packet to London and by Edin^g North Britain.

Thursday, 28th. This morning I rec^d from Benjamin Edge by the hand of his daughter two Dollars, one half and one Quarter Dollar being in all sixteen shillings and Sixpence in part payment for teaching his son

¹ On the west of the island of Mainland, about ten miles from Lerwick.

and daughter. Same day I seed a Comp^y of 70 Men belonging to one of the Regiments of Regullars raised here for the defence of the rights and liberties of this Coll^y in particular and of North America in Generall. They were on their March to Williamsburg.

Thursday, October 12th. Company here last night Viz! Old M^rs Waler, her son and his wife and at school there M^r Heely Schoolmaster and M^r Brooks Carpenter and they wth M^r Frazer and myself played whist and danced untill 12 OClock, M^r Heely the Fidle and dancing. We drank one bottle of rum in time. M^r Frazer verry sick after they went home.

Munday, 16th. This morning 3 men went to work to break, swingle and heckle flax and one woman to spin in order to make course linnen for shirts to the Nigers, This being the first of the kind that was made on the plantation. And before this year there has been little or no linnen made in the Colony.

Tuesday 17th. Two women spining wool on the bigg wheel and one woman spinning flax on the little wheel all designed for the Nigers.

Munday, 23d. One Frieday last I lent to Miss Lucy one pair of my shoes to spin with. This day General Washintons Lady dined here, As did her son and Daug^r in Law,¹ M^rs Spotswood, M^rs Campbell, M^rs Dansie, Miss Washington and Miss Dandrige, They being all of the highes Rank and fortunes of any in this Colony.

Saturday, 28th. Last night came here to school M^r Heely and Tho^s Brooks in order to spend the evening, but by reason of M^r Frazer's not coming from the House, and some stories told them by M^rs Richards in order to sow disention, She being really a Wolf cloathed with a lambs skin and the greatest Mischief maker I have seen in all my Travels, The first time I seed her, I cou'd observe in her countenance Slynness and deceit, and I have always avoided going to the House as much as possible, But now I really think she ought to be avoided by every christian who regairds peace and their own character, They both went home at 10 pm.

Sunday, 29th. Yesterday at noon M^r Heely came here and asked me to take a walk with him in order to see Miss Molly White late housekeeper at Newport she having some shirts of his making for him, and after crossing the river we found her at an Aunts house of hers one M^rs Hansfords where we stayed all night, and this day Miss Molly came with us two Miles to a Gentlemans house in our way home, and after aquanting M^r Heely where his shirts was ready for him the conversation turned upon clearing themselves to each other of most malicious stories raised by the above M^rs Richards in order to set them at variance and included with them was Miss Lucy Gaines our housekeeper, and myself. But now that every one has discovered the snake, I belive in time coming her bite will be avoided.

¹ John Parke Custis and his wife Eleanor Calvert. The Mrs. Spotswood referred to was probably the wife of Col. Alexander Spotswood of Newport, a niece of Gen. Washington. Mrs. Campbell was probably Mary, the widow of John Spotswood, son of the governor, who married John Campbell, Gentleman. Miss Washington must have been a niece of Gen. Washington, and Miss Dandridge was perhaps a niece of his wife.

Thursday, November 9th. Upon Thursday 2^d Ins^t there was a Camp Marked out close at the back of the school for a Batalion of 500 private men besides officers and they immediatly began to erect tents for the same.¹ And this day the whole was finished for 250 men being 50 tents for the privates and 6 D^o for officers and 3 D^o for the Comissary and his stores, with one for a Buffalo which is to be shown which I shall afterwards describe.—This day the 250 men being 5 Companys from different parts araved at the Camp the other 5 Companys not being as yet compleated.

Saturday, 11th. At 11 OClock forenoon I rode to Toun and bought one stone Mugg and Tin pot at 10d. and 1¼ yd. Linen at 5/ of which I wanted two stocks for winter wear, and the rest of it I made a present to Miss Lucy, for her readiness to do any little thing for me; I seed no worsted stockins for sale but one pair all Moth eaten and as they were they asked no less than 6/ for them. I dined at M^r Porters spent 7½ at M^r Anderson and then came home by sun down.

Sunday, 12th. This day a great number of company from Toun and Country to see the Camp four of which (Gentlemen) paid me a visite which put me to 1/3 expence for a bottle of rum. at noon by Accident one of the Captains tents was set on fire and all consumed but none of things of any Acco^t Lost.

Munday, 13th. This forenoon the Col^l sent a waggon Load of Turnups and Pitatoes to the Camp as a present for all the men.

Tuesday, 14th. All the minute-men in the Camp employed learning their exercise.

Wednesday, 15th. This morning I drank a small dram of rum made thick with brown suggar for the cold, it being the first dram I have drunk since I lived on the Plantation.

Thursday, 16th. The soldiers at muster.

Freiday, 17th. The soldiers at D^o, and I left of going into the Nursery and taking charge of the children out of school.

Wednesday, 29th. This day the camp was brocke up and the whole Batallion dismissed after each private receiving 22 days pay at 1/4 per day and 1/ for provisions out and home. During the time the camp was by the school it cost me 8/ 1½ of expences which is more by 2/ than it cost me for 12 Months before.

Saturday, December 2d. At noon went to Toun and seed two Companys of regulars from the Ohio among which was one real Indian. he was of a Yelow couler short brod faced and rather flat nosed, and long course black [hair] quite streight. he spoke verry good english. I staid in Toun all night and slept at M^r Andersons; I bought from M^r Porter a black Silk Handkerchief at 5/.

Sunday, 3d. After breackfast I went and found out Miss Molly White and left with her cloth to make me two winter Stocks and a stock to make them by. Dined in Toun, came home in the afternoon.

¹ An ordinance of the July Convention had provided for twenty days' drill on the part of the minute-men of each group of counties. The minute-men of the district composed of Caroline, Spotsylvania, King George and Stafford were to number five hundred rank and file. Hening, IX. 16

Wednesday, 27th.

- 1st Both the last nights quite drunk was I,
Pray God forgive me [of] the sin;
But had I been in good company,
Me in that case No man had seen.
- 2^d Plac'd by myself, without the camp,
As if I were unclean—
No friendly soul does my floor tramp,
My greiff to ease, or hear my moan.
- 3^d For in a prison at large I'm plac't,
Bound to it, day and night;
O, grant me patience, god of grace.
And in thy paths make me walk right.
- 4th This day alone, at home I am,
Repenting sadly and full sore
That ever the like unto me came.
When this I see, The cause I will repent for ever more.

Wednesday, January 10th, 1776. This day we hade the Confirmation of Norfolk being reduced to ashes by the Men of War and British Troops under Command of Lord Dunmore. It was the Largest Toun in the Collony and a place of great Trade, it being situated a little within the Capes. Severall Women and Childⁿ are killed.

Saturday, 13th. After 12 O Clock I went six Miles into the Forrest to one Daniel Dempsies to see if they wou'd spin three pound of Cotton to run 8 yds. per lb., $\frac{2}{3}$ of it belonging to Miss Lucy Gaines for a gown and $\frac{1}{3}$ belonging to myself for Vestcoats, which they ag^d to do if I carried the cotton there on Saturd^y 27th. Ins^t

Sunday, 14th. At 11 AM I Sett out for Mansfield the seat of Man Page,¹ Esq^r in order to see one M^r Reid Gairdner² who came from Dunkell in Scotland. M^r Scott Watch maker from Toun being also with him. I staid with them untill after sundown, having dined and being verry genteely entertained. M^r and M^{rs} Porter and all their Children came here to dinner and staid all night.

Munday, 15th. Miss Lucy spinning my croop of Cotton at night after her work is done; to make me a pair of gloves.

Wednesday, 17th. This evening Miss Lucy came to school with M^r Frazer and me, and finished my croop of Cotton by winding it, after its being doubled and twisted the whole consisting of two ounces.

Tuesday, 23d. This day I entred Edwin into the Latin Gramer.

Saturday, 27th. After 12 pm I went to the forrest to the house of Daniel Dempsies and carried with me three pound of pick'd Cotton two of which belongs to Miss Lucy Gaines and one to me, which his wife has

¹ Mann Page of Mansfield, half-brother of Governor John Page, was a member of the Continental Congress in 1777.

² I. e., gardener.

agreed to spin to run 8 Yd^s per lb., I paing her five shillings per lb. for spinning it and it is to be done by the end of May next.

Tuesday, March 5th. This morning Bathurest Daingerfield got don reading through the Bible and the Newtestament, and began to learn to write 15 Ult^o. I gave them Holyday this Afternoon.

Saturday, April 20th. At noon I asked the Col^o for a bottle of rum as I expected two Countrymen to see me tomorrow, which he verry cheerfully gave and desired me to ask him for one any time I wanted it and told me to take them to the Howse to dinner with me. in the afternoon he, his Lady, and Daughter went over the river to M^r Jones's in King George County.

Tuesday, 23d. At noon rode to Town, got the Newspapers and settled with M^r Porter for teaching his two sons 12 M^{os} when he verry genteely allowed me £6 for them, besides a present of two silk vests and two pair of Nankeen Breeches last summer and a Gallon of rum at Christenmass, both he and M^r.^s Porter being extreamly well satisfied with what I hade don to them.

Wednesday, 24th. General Muster of all the County Malitia in Town today. at Breackfast the Col^o desired me to go and see it if I pleased, But being in town yesterday I chose to stay to day with my boys.

Sunday, 28th. This day came here to pay me a visit M^r Reid from Mansfield and M^r Scott from Toun and dined with me in the great house by the Col^{os} order, and after we hade spent the afternoon verry agreeably together they returned home in the evening.

Sunday, May 5th. Early this morning I went to M^r McCalley's and entred his oldest son (about 8 years of age) to writting, stayed there all day and rode his horse home in the evening. The Col^o went to Newport and dinned there.

Tuesday, 7th. Billie ended reading through his Bible.

Thursday, 9th. After dinner I took the boys with me to Massaponacks Briges to see 56 prisoners that was taken at the late battle in North Carolina,¹ among them was a great many Emigrants from Scotland who were all officers. I talked with several of them from Ross Sh^r and the Isle of Sky.

Freiday, 17th. Gen^l Fast by order of the Congress. I went to Church in Toun but no sarmon. dined at M^r McAlleys and came home in the evening. The Col^o and his Lady at Mount C^l.

Munday, 27th. At 9 AM I went to M^r McAlleys and staid teaching his Son and sister untill dark and then rode home bringing with me 1½ Yd. Linen for summer breeches.

Thursday, June 6th. In the afternoon I went to M^r Becks, when he told me that M^{rs} Battle wanted to see me and to talk to me about teaching her two daughters to write, upon which I imediatly waited upon her and engaged to return upon Saturd next by 1 pm and begin them to write but made no bargain as yet.

¹ Battle of Moore's Creek Bridge, February 27, 1776. In the list of prisoners, Force's *American Archives*, Fourth Series, V. 63, are many Highland names.

Saturday, 8th. At noon I went to M^{rs} Bataile's and entred two of her Daughters to writting, Viz. Miss Sallie and Miss Betty and continoued teaching them until night, when I agreed to attend them every Saturday afternoon and every other Sunday from this date until 8th June 1777 (If it please God to spare me) for four pound Virginia currancy.

Sunday, 9th. After breackfast I rode to M^r McAlleys and teach'd his son to write untill 4 pm and then came home in the evening.

Freiday, 14th. At noon Went to Jn^o McDearmons and had 6 Yd^s stript Cotton warped for 2 Veastcoats and two handkerchiefs all prepared at my own expence.

Wednesday, 19th. At noon went to snow creek and the boys and dined at the spring on Barbaque and fish. At 5 pm I went to M^{rs} Bataile and teac'd until $\frac{1}{2}$ an hour past 7.

Wednesday 26th. At 5 pm I went to M^r Becks and had a short Coat cut out of cotton cloth wove Jeans. I bought the cotton and paid for spinning it at the rate of 2/6 per lb. and one shilling per Yd. for weaving.

Sunday, July 7th. This morning I rode to Mansfield and breackfast with M^r Reid and stayed and dined with him and in the afternoon he and I rode to see the Rowgallies that was building where we met with M^r Anderson and Jacob Whitely and went to Town with them to Whitelys where we Joyned in Comp^y with M^r Wright and one M^r Bruce from King George. about 11 pm we brock up and every one went to his own home as I did.

Wednesday, 10th. At 6 pm went to M^{rs} Battaile's and teach'd untill sunset and then return'd home and soon after hea[r]d a great many guns fired towards Toun. about 12 pm the Col^o Despatched Anth^y Frazer there to see what was the cause of [it] who returned, and informed him that there was great rejoicings in Toun on Acco^t of the Congress having declared the 13 United Colonys of North America Independent of the Crown of great Britain.

Thursday, 25th. I imployed this morn^g and forenoon getting Lead off Snowcreek house.¹

¹ Probably for military uses.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Primitive Love and Love-Stories. By HENRY T. FINCK. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1899. Pp. xvii, 851.)

THE present volume may be regarded as a sequel to the author's earlier work, *Romantic Love and Personal Beauty*. The central thesis of this earlier production was that human love, far from being "always the same," as the poets and even the psychologists have commonly regarded it, has been subject to the laws of development and change, and that romantic love, which differs from conjugal affection, is an essentially modern experience, of which no trace can be found among primitive peoples, or even among the Greeks and Romans. This position was attacked by many of his critics, and it is in defense of it that Mr. Finck has written *Primitive Love and Love-Stories*, which is an exhaustive treatment of the whole question at issue. It embodies the results of a study of a large body of primitive and classical literature, and of the leading works on ethnology which throw light upon the subject. The book itself is a valuable contribution to the special subject with which it deals.

The first three hundred and fifty pages of the work are devoted mainly to an analysis of romantic love, and to a direct exposition and defense of the author's theory. The remainder is chiefly occupied with an account of the customs and sentiments attending love and marriage among different races, as revealed in their literature. A closing chapter is devoted to "Utility and Future of Love," and excellent indexes are added. A bibliography and index of authors is given, separate from the index of subjects.

Mr. Finck prepares the way for an acceptance of his theory by showing how other sentiments besides that of love have been transformed in the course of their development. He appeals to the well-known fact that not only do savages the world over stand in mortal terror of certain wild and romantic aspects of nature, which often arouse the profoundest emotions of delight in educated moderns, but the Greeks and Romans also shared the same feeling of dislike and dread, as Humboldt, Friedlaender, and Rhode have shown. He also discusses the change in religious ideas and emotions, which in primitive religions have been as crude and coarse as were the beginnings of the sentiment of love. For other illustrations of the transformation of ideas and their attendant emotions certain moral notions are chosen—murder, polygamy, incest, chastity, etc., conceptions which have manifestly changed so radically in the moral evolution of the race that they have in some instances been completely inverted.

The author then proceeds to offer a psychological analysis of love, and finds fourteen distinct ingredients, seven of which are egoistic and seven altruistic. The latter are sympathy, affection, gallantry, self-sacrifice, adoration, purity and admiration of personal beauty. Each of the fourteen elements receives a detailed treatment, and its presence or absence among primitive peoples is illustrated from ethnological data. While the egoistic ingredients of love have changed, it is in the emergence of the leading altruistic ingredients, such as sympathy, gallantry, and self-sacrifice, that romantic love, as it exists among the most highly developed moderns, differs from anything found among primitive peoples, or even the classical nations of antiquity. One cannot refrain from wondering, much as in the case of Kant's categories, how it happens that there are just fourteen of these ingredients, that there is this perfect balance in the two groups, and whether a more searching analysis might not show that there are other essential elements, or that some of those given are reducible to still more elementary forms.

The student who has endeavored to trace the historical evolution of moral sentiments will find no *a priori* difficulty in the general features of Mr. Finck's theory. He will rather be inclined to view it with favor. For modern historical and anthropological studies have ruthlessly destroyed the sentimentality of the Rousseau type, which looked upon the "noble savage" as the embodiment of all the elemental virtues of human nature. The more the light of actual knowledge has been turned upon his life the more clearly has it been seen that Hobbes's terms more truthfully characterize it,—"solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short." The book may well be recommended to those who still accept intuitionism in morals. It should prove a specific in all except those hopeless cases in which the facts are made to fit a cherished theory.

Mr. Finck's general position is, I think, well sustained. As against the platitudes which have declared that "love is always the same," it seems abundantly vindicated. Love could always be "the same" only if human nature were so. And, despite all the maxims, human nature has not always been the same. It is rather a thing of growth and change, capable of assuming radically different forms in different environments. In the past it has often manifested itself in contradictory ways, developing in one place a mode of life and a set of ideals the direct antithesis of those found in another. And, as for the future, "It doth not yet appear what we shall be." The point at which the author seems to me chiefly to err is in expounding his theory somewhat too summarily,—in not giving his statement of it sufficient elasticity to fit all the complex facts of history and of human experience. If his view is correct there surely must have been a beginning of the higher, the romantic, form of love. It did not spring up suddenly as a new element in life, but was closely linked to what went before. It seems unnatural that there should have been absolutely no manifestation of it prior to the dawn of the modern era. Is it not far more reasonable to suppose that for its beginnings, imperfect and crude as they may have been, one must look to the later classical

world, or even to the more highly developed among still more primitive peoples? Occasionally, too, there seems to be a want of imagination, and a consequent failure to allow for the contradictions and anomalies which appear in the character of the same individual. Thus he thinks it impossible that Odysseus, who behaved so cruelly to women, could truthfully be represented as wiping away a tear when he sees that he is recognized by his faithful dog Argos. Is it not, on the contrary, often the fact that men capable, on occasion, of extreme cruelty, have displayed great fondness for a favorite animal? It should be added, however, that the case of Odysseus is not a significant illustration for either the one view or the other. His emotional experience is dependent upon the total situation in which he finds himself, and the recognition by his old dog is merely the occasion for the overflow of feelings already highly charged with emotion. .

WALTER GOODNOW EVERETT.

The Races of Man. An Outline of Anthropology and Ethnography. By J. DENIKER. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. xxiii, 611.)

THIS compact little volume by the librarian of the Museum of Natural History at Paris is by all odds the best compendium of these sciences extant in English. It is far more complete and reliable than Brinton's *Races and Peoples*; more thoroughly digested and scientific than the recently published erudite volumes by Keane; and less narrowly Gallic in its sources of information than De Quatrefages in his *Human Species*. In this latter respect, as well as in its comprehensive scope, it most nearly approaches the type of Peschel's *Races of Man*; which for a quarter-century has been a standard classic. The principal defect, if it be one indeed, is that the learned author has sought to cram too many facts and too much detail of classification within the compass of a single small volume. The result may, not improbably, be to produce a blurred and confusing effect upon the mind of the undergraduate student or the general reader. Viewed as a defect from this standpoint, however, such a wealth of detailed knowledge renders the book for the specialist a veritable mine of information, suitable for comparative study and further elaboration.

The book naturally divides itself into three distinct parts. The first of these in three chapters is concerned with physical anthropology, including the relation of man to the anthropoid apes. In this domain our author in virtue of his own special investigations is at his best. We note with surprise, however, the absence of any reference to such standard authorities as Huxley, Hartmann or Darwin. Awkwardness of expression also results in many places from failure to adopt our English distinction between the cranial and the cephalic index. As would be naturally expected from the author's recent detailed researches upon the distribution of the cephalic index in Europe, especial stress is laid upon the im-

portance of the head-form as a criterion of racial descent. It is refreshing to have so clear an expression of opinion upon this point, in view of the insular and sceptical attitude assumed by certain of our American scientists. In one matter alone do we take issue flatly with his data and his conclusions; namely in his optimistic views (p. 118) concerning the possibility of acclimatization of the European in the tropics. As we have elsewhere pointed out, this view is entirely out of joint with the expressed opinion of nearly all scientific authority.

The second portion of the book, dealing with psychic and sociological phenomena, constitutes perhaps the least satisfactory portion. It is obviously an impossible task to treat of such topics in a philosophical way within the limits of three chapters. The chapter upon language, for example, failing to point to the parallel between the child-mind and the ideation of the savage, is hopelessly inadequate. The absence of any use of Romanes's work in this field is indicative of this defect. The author revives our interest again, however, in the concluding seven chapters, devoted to ethnography. Each of the continental groups of man is described in a masterly way, with a wealth of bibliographical knowledge which is most commendable. Our author seems to be acquainted with practically all of the best authorities, and that too at first hand. Only one section of this part of the work seems to us to be seriously at fault. We refer to his treatment and complicated classification of the population of Europe. Space forbids that we should enter upon criticism of his ten-fold division into European "races" in place of the traditional three; especially since we have already done so in detail in our own work upon the *Races of Europe*. The weight of authority still persists in regarding his "races" rather as "types"; and recent publication of data upon the subject has confirmed this objection to his scheme.

One of the great merits of this excellent book consists in its wealth of detailed citation of authorities. This renders it all the more lamentable that the bibliographical work should be so villainously out of form. There is scarcely a part, wherein some careless slip of spelling, accent or punctuation does not occur. One might indeed excuse the misspelling of proper names such as Gönner (p. 74), Euscalduna (p. 348), Braemer (p. 335), Erismann (p. 31) or Regàlia (p. 77), or even the woful miscapitalization of German texts; but the persistent neglect of accent in such common French words as *Mémoire* (pp. 29, 34 and 42 for example) is inexcusable in a work of this kind, from which copied citations are certain to be made. Only a few slips of a more serious order occur, such as the omission of "per cent." (p. 56), the mistranslation of *broad* into our English word *large* (p. 71) and Niederle 1897, which should be 1896 (p. 344).

The book is well illustrated from refreshingly original photographs; and as we have already said, despite its defects, many of which may be eliminated in its certain future editions, is a notable contribution to science.

WILLIAM Z. RIPLEY.

Religion of Israel to the Exile. By KARL BUDDE, D.D., Professor of Theology in Strassburg. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1899. Pp. xix, 228.)

IN 1892 a committee was organized for the purpose of arranging courses of popular lectures on religious history, to be styled "American Lectures on the History of Religions." Series have been given on Buddhism (by Rhys Davids), on the religions of primitive peoples (by Brinton), and on Jewish religious life after the exile (by Cheyne); the fourth series is published in the present volume. The Israelitish religious history naturally divides itself into three periods: the pre-Mosaic, or pre-Yahwistic, or nomadic, about which little or nothing is known, the stories of the patriarchs in Genesis being a legendary reflection of later times; the first formative and creative period, in which the sole worship of Yahweh was established; and the period of strict ecclesiastical organization. It is the second period, extending from the thirteenth century B. C. to the sixth, that Professor Budde here describes.

The first question he considers is the origin of the Israelitish worship of Yahweh. The Pentateuch narrative is compiled from three documents: the Yahwistic (the earliest, known as J), the Elohist (E), and the late Priestly (P). In E (Ex. iii. 13f.) and P (Ex. vi. 2ff.) it is said that the name Yahweh was revealed for the first time to Moses, while J (Gen. iv. 26 *al.*) assumes that it was known from the earliest times, long before the period of the patriarchs. What is the meaning of this discrepancy? Dr. Budde, in agreement with a large number of scholars, explains it as follows: the cult of Yahweh was practised by the Midianites or Kenites, from whom it was taken by Moses and introduced into Israel; a Kenite colony established itself in the south of Canaan, the territory of Judah, and the Kenite tradition, embodied in J (which was composed in that region), represents the worship of Yahweh as primeval, since the Kenites knew no other deity; on the other hand, E (followed by P) embodies the Ephraimite tradition, which was conscious of having received Yahweh from an outside source. Dr. Budde further holds that the story in Ex. xviii. (in which the Midianite priest Jethro takes the leading part in a national sacrifice to Yahweh) really describes a solemn covenant by which Israel adopted Yahweh as its god, and this, he says, is the oldest known example of such adoption, by a people, of a foreign deity. Such a procedure does not seem to me probable; I should rather suppose that the Yahweh cult came to Israel through a slow process of social intercourse; the episode is, however, obscure, and a definitive judgment is hardly possible. It is probable that the Israelites took the Yahweh cult from Midian; how Midian got it, and what is the meaning of the name Yahweh, we do not know.

This preliminary question is of less interest than the history of Israel's religious career in Canaan. How the Hebrew nomads, entering agricultural Canaan, gradually adopted the social and religious customs of its more cultivated people, and how the Yahweh religion maintained it-

self against the attractions of the local Baals and of splendid foreign cults, growing out of its original crudeness into a substantially monotheistic faith with a high moral standard—all this is clearly and forcibly told by our author, who handles his vast mass of materials with great skill. Of necessity much that he says is common property, the generally received outcome of recent criticism. He has, however, fresh points of view, as, for example, in his treatment of Manasseh's introduction of the Assyrian astral worship. This worship, he observes, came in as the fashion of the day (imitation of the cult of the suzerain power), but the very fact that the King assigned a place in Yahweh's temple to sun, moon and stars shows that these were looked on as vassals of the god of Israel, to whom, therefore, Manasseh was not untrue. And immediately on Manasseh followed the Deuteronomic law (Dt. xii.—xxvi.) which is bitter against foreign customs. Dr. Budde calls attention, on the other hand, to the ease with which the people slid into foreign ways of worship—witness the naïve speech of the Jerusalem women to Jeremiah (Jer. xlv. 15ff.). He thinks, also, that some of the stories in Gen. i.—xi. were adopted at this time from the Assyrians—a view less popular now than formerly, many scholars holding that the Genesis myths came to Israel through the Canaanites from the Babylonians. Dr. Budde's work may be commended as eminently trustworthy and interesting.

C. H. Toy.

Alexander the Great; The Merging of East and West in Universal History. By BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, President of the University of California. ["Heroes of the Nations" Series.] (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1900. Pp. xv, 520.)

THE greater part of this book is already known to many in the twelve copiously and strikingly illustrated articles on Alexander the Great which appeared in the *Century Magazine*, Vols. LVII. and LVIII., November 1898 to October 1899 inclusive. The last nine of these articles reappear in book form with text substantially unchanged, pp. 227-501. To the first three extensive additions have been made, and some slight changes in the text which is common to magazine and book. Chapters V.—VIII. (pp. 81-148), entitled in order "The Old Greece, 336 B. C.," "Old Greece—Its Political Organizations, 336 B. C.," "The Political Ideas of the Fourth Century, 404-338 B. C.," are almost entirely new. Pp. 35-63, on the education of Alexander, are a welcome expansion of what occupies little more than a single page of the magazine. Perhaps a dozen pages of new material have also been inserted here and there in the first and third papers of the magazine, supplementing the information first given about the Macedonian and Persian peoples, their countries, political and religious principles. None of this new matter reads like addenda to the original articles, but as though it had been once excised from the work to adapt it better for popular presentation in the pages of a monthly magazine. It is generally such material as the scholar and the historian,

rather than the general reader, will welcome. In the slight changes of text common to book and magazine which have been made necessary by these expansions and additions, several flippancies of expression, which originally offended the more judicious reader, have been eliminated. Alexander, for instance, in rebuking Aristotle for publishing the "acromatic doctrines," no longer figures as "one of the earliest opponents of university extension." The book would have gained in dignity if this eliminating process had been carried beyond the original first three magazine articles.

In its illustrations the book gains decidedly upon the magazine, though its gain is chiefly in its loss. It loses the flamboyant and utterly unhistorical full-page illustrations by Castaigne and Loeb, which were such a feature of the magazine articles, which doubtless caught the eye of the "groundlings," but which illustrated anything and everything except Alexander's career. The invaluable illustrations from coins and portrait statuary generally remain in the book. We miss unwillingly the Boston head of Alexander, found at Ptolemais, and even the so-called "Dying Alexander" of the Uffizi, but more than either the Etruscan statuette of the Tyrian Hercules, or the bronze statuette of Alexander in armor, with the Lysippus portrait touch. We miss also the drawings by Harry Fenn (can one ever forget the view of Budrum from the rock tomb?), and cannot reconcile ourselves to accepting in their place the unauthenticated and really useless drawings of the Acropolis of Sardis (p. 196), the scene on the coast of Asia Minor (p. 242), and the Gygean Lake (p. 246), which are evidently meant to vary the monotony of busts and coins. The maps of the book are generally better than those of the magazine, and for two new ones, "The Persian Empire about 500 B. C., and the Empire of Alexander the Great" (p. 192) and "Alexander's Crossing of the Hydaspes and Battle with Porus" (p. 440), we cannot be too grateful. We would, however, gladly exchange Thorwaldsen's "Triumph of Alexander" (p. 180), which is well enough as a paginal head-piece in the *Century Magazine*, but worthless as historical illustration, for the meanest Macedonian coin. Perhaps, however, publishers' amenities lie back of the singular choices and variations from the *Century's* wealth of illustrative and ornamental material. Nor must the book be denied its right to ornament pure and simple, regardless of illustrative accuracy.

The book is the best popular history of Alexander extant. It is the best kind of a popular history, written by a Greek scholar of minute and expert detailed knowledge, who has at the same time a broad and sound historical philosophy. It is written from within outwards,—centrifugally, after mastery of the original and primary, as well as of secondary and modern sources. In general its tendency is rather too romantic. It gives too much weight in many cases to the imaginative traditions about Alexander which were incorporated in the work of Kleitarchos, and which were passed on by Diodorus, Curtius Rufus, and Plutarch, when they are not substantiated and even when they are contradicted by the

testimonies of Kallisthenes, Eumenes, Chares, Nearchus, Aristobulos or Ptolemy Lagus. Occasionally, too, the rhetoric of Arrian is not taken with the proper grains of salt. But perhaps this tendency was natural and even inevitable in preparing a history of this scope and purpose. Barring the flippant touches here and there, already alluded to, the book is written with power and charm, and will help to dislodge from the popular mind many ideas of Alexander and of his career which have been fastened there by Rollin's *History* and Plutarch's *Lives*, even if it is not as corrective along this line as the severest historical critic might wish. In the main issue it is wholesomely corrective, inasmuch as it teaches that Alexander's work was not destructive, nor his career that of a mere mad conqueror. As a great sower he went forth over all the world to sow, but the soil of the world had first to be prepared for the sowing.

In another respect President Wheeler's work is most helpful and instructive. It keeps before the reader the modern political conditions, the modern geography, commerce, routes of travel, social states, and local or national ambitions which tax the statesmanship of our day in administering the incoherent fragments of what was once the world-empire of Alexander. Had Alexander penetrated further into India, and into China, and performed there too his work of sower, European civilization might not at this moment be confronted with so ghastly a problem.

Caesar's Conquest of Gaul. By T. RICE HOLMES. (London and New York: The Macmillan Co. 1899. Pp. xlv, 846.)

"It is to be wished rather than hoped that the appalling mass of printed matter which, for four centuries, has been accumulating around the Commentaries, may not be swelled in the future by mere verbiage' (pp. xvii. f.). An author who thus writes in the preface to a volume of nearly nine hundred large octavo pages devoted to the one hundred and ninety-three small Teubner pages of "the unpretending little book which Caesar wrote two thousand years ago in the scanty leisure of a busy life," must certainly be unconscious of the irony of his situation. But the book is fascinating, in spite of its undeniable verbiage and quite unnecessary bulk. And when the reader once becomes conscious of the magnitude of the task which the author has undertaken, and of the long years of patient, exhaustive labor which the performance of the task has cost, he will not cavil at discursiveness here and there, especially as the style is always agreeable, nor at what often seems superfluity of theme.

The design of the book is to give an annotated English narrative of Caesar's conquest of Gaul, which shall be not only useful to teachers and interesting to general readers, but also worthy of the notice of scholars and students of the art of war. This might well have been done in pp. 1-162, the actual narrative, with the addition of pp. 607-807, the running commentary, the latter judiciously enriched with some of the critical, ethnological, geographical, political, historical and military material which now bulks out into pp. 165-606. We should then have

had a book of about half the size of this, likely to win more readers and do far more good, even though less of a thesaurus.

For that is what Mr. Holmes's book now is, a thesaurus of all that has been written, good, bad and indifferent, on Gaul and its conquest by Caesar. It serves the student of Caesar's Gallic War much as Frazer's *Pausanias* serves the student of that author. Not only are the monumental editions and epoch-making treatises called forth by the *Commentaries* duly named, described, and conscientiously utilized, with excellent independence of judgment; but obscure articles hidden away among the transactions of various archaeological societies, numberless monographs, pamphlets and even medieval chronicles have been diligently hunted down and collated. The "bibliographical note" which forms part of the introductory matter (pp. xxv.-xxvi.), is a bibliography of bibliographies. "For fear I might have overlooked any reference to articles in foreign periodicals, I also worked through the back numbers of all the transactions of learned societies, French and German, which I could find on the shelves of the gallery which they occupy in the British Museum."

After the preface (pp. v.-xix.), which is written *con amore*, and tells the reader how the work grew to its present dimensions from the first modest projection, comes a short paper on "The Busts of Julius Caesar" (pp. xx.-xxv.); then the "Bibliographical Note"; then a controversy entitled "Mr. Stock's Edition of Caesar's Gallic War and Colonel Stoffel's Excavations" (pp. xxvi.-xxx.); and then the usual table of contents.

Part I. (pp. 1-162) consists of the narrative proper of the conquest of Gaul. It is not a translation, nor even a free paraphrase of Caesar, but a connected narrative based more or less closely on the words of Caesar. The author's exhaustive study of the topography of the various routes and sites enables him to supply, where they most aid the narrative, ample geographical and strategical details. Gaps in the terse story of Caesar are inferentially filled, and, on the other hand, those episodes which do not bear directly on the conquest of Gaul, like the inroads into Britain, are omitted. Again, not all of Caesar's movements in Gaul are fully determined, but only those sections of his devious track which can be followed with certainty. The student of Caesar and above all the lover of Caesar's Latinity, will use this "narrative" only as an accompaniment to the immortal text. The general reader, who may not know Latin, will get almost no idea of the literary features of the great *Commentaries*. At the risk of seeming ungrateful to one who has conferred a boon on all lovers of Caesar, the wish might be hazarded that Mr. Holmes had given us in Part I. a straightforward, idiomatic translation of Caesar's words, as Mr. Frazer has translated his Pausanias, and incorporated all the interesting "fuel material" in the running commentary which now constitutes Section VII. (pp. 607-823).

As a fair specimen of the liberties of omission and commission which Mr. Holmes has allowed himself with the words of Caesar, it will be sufficient to cite Caesar's account of that part of his first great battle with the Helvetii which followed the dangerous flank and rear attack of the Boii

and Tulingi, the Helvetii returning to the charge in front (*B. G.*, I. 26), and the corresponding "narrative" of Mr. Holmes. Caesar says: "Ita ancipiti proelio diu atque acriter pugnatum est. Diutius cum sustinere nostrorum impetus non possent, alteri se, ut coeperant, in montem receperunt; alteri ad impedimenta et carros suos se contulerunt. Nam hoc toto proelio, cum ab hora septima ad vesperum pugnatum sit, aversum hostem videre nemo potuit. Ad multam noctem etiam ad impedimenta pugnatum est, propterea quod pro vallo carros obiecerant et e loco superiore in nostros venientes tela coniciebant, et nonnulli inter carros rotasque mataras ac tragulas subiciebant nostrosque vulnerabant. Diu cum esset pugnatum, impedimentis castrisque nostri potiti sunt. Ibi Orgetorigis filia atque unus e filiis captus est. Ex eo proelio circiter hominum milia CXXX superfuere et nocte continenter ierunt."

Corresponding to these terse words Mr. Holmes has (p. 35): "Long and fiercely the battle was fought out. In due time the cohorts of the second line relieved those of the first, advancing between the files as the latter withdrew; and again the first line relieved, in its turn, the second. Gradually the Helvetii were forced further up the hill; while the Boii and Tulingi retreated to their baggage. Standing behind the wall of waggons, they hurled down stones and darts upon the advancing Romans, and thrust at them with long pikes when they attempted to storm the laager. The struggle was prolonged far into the night. At length the legionaries burst through the barrier. Women and children who could not escape were slaughtered; and the flying remnant of the invading host disappeared in the darkness of the night. . . . What despair fell upon the baffled emigrants; how the jaded cattle were headed round again towards the north, and goaded through that night; how those who escaped the slaughter tramped after, and told the tale of the calamity; the din, the confusion, the long weariness of the retreat,—these things it is easy to imagine, but those only who have shared the rout and ruin of a beaten army can adequately realize."

The Second Part is intended more for scholars. Section I. (pp. 165-244) deals with the MSS., text, and editions of the *Commentaries on the Gallic War*, with the questions "When did Caesar write the *Commentaries on the Gallic War*, and when were they published," and with the various attacks which have been made upon the credibility of Caesar's narrative. Section II. deals with the ethnology and population of Gaul (pp. 245-327). Section III. (pp. 328-514) is "purely geographical," and consists for the most part of an elaborate geographical index. Section IV. (pp. 515-547) is entitled "Social, Political and Religious," and discusses such topics as monarchy, democracy, private property in Gaul and the Druids. Sections V. and VI. (pp. 548-562, and 563-606) contain such historical summaries and technical details of the Roman art of war as are necessary or helpful in introducing or supplementing the narrative of Caesar. Section VII., finally, is the running commentary on the narrative of Caesar (pp. 607-811), and closes with a chapter on Celtic names, and various addenda (pp. 811-825).

In this second part the author has conscientiously given the arguments for as well as against all the conclusions adopted by him in his "narrative." He does this for his own satisfaction, for that of scholars, and of the "few general readers who are not contented with mere results, but want to know the evidence on which they are based." He has here attempted "to collect, co-ordinate, and estimate the results of the innumerable researches which have aimed at throwing light upon the problems of Gallic History." He is not a mere chronicler of opposing views and theories. He pronounces judgment, and with the air of authority which his long and thorough researches give him the right to assume. "Von Kampen is quite right, and the author of the article has thought himself into a muddle" (p. 784), is only one of many clear and positive decisions which greet the often muddled reader of controversial views. Possibly too many and too inferior views are given the dignity of a discussion. One could wish that Mr. Holmes had here applied the scorn which he so well expresses towards limitless conjectural emendations of Caesar's text (p. xviii.). But this failing shall not detract from the gratitude due for a helpful thesaurus of discussion on Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum*.

Twenty Famous Naval Battles. Salamis to Santiago. By EDWARD KIRK RAWSON, Professor United States Navy, Superintendent Naval War Records. (New York and Boston: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co. [1900]. Two vols., pp. xxx, 344, 730.)

ONE would expect to find a great sameness in twenty naval battles, but the reader of these volumes goes on from chapter to chapter with eager and increasing interest. This is partly due to the fact that, in spite of certain eccentricities of style, the author has the power of dramatic narrative, and partly to the fact that the book improves both in matter and manner as it approaches the more modern periods. But even after the higher level of excellence is reached the interest does not flag and there is no feeling that one sea-fight is after all but a repetition of another. A further reason for the sustained interest lies in the constantly changing conditions of naval warfare. The book takes us through all stages of its evolution. Salamis, Actium and Lepanto illustrate the first era, that of oars. The Armada marks the transition to the second era, the era of warfare under sail. We see the Spaniards with characteristic indecision compromising between the old and the new and perhaps, too, hampered by their traditions as a power partly Mediterranean, partly oceanic, hesitating in this as in all things to leave the Middle Ages behind them. While they put galleys and the famous Neapolitan galleasses amongst the more modern galleons, the English, having thoroughly broken with the past, sent out a homogeneous sailing fleet, relegating their only galleys to humiliating river service.

After the signal and fateful victory of the northern and Teutonic navy over the school of Spain comes the fierce struggle between two Teu-

tonic peoples with navies of the same type. England after varying fortunes emerges victorious from this ordeal only to find herself once again pitted against a Latin and Romanist navy. Trafalgar is of course the culmination of this period, the first victory of England over the combined fleets of the two Latin empires which had disputed with her one after the other the supremacy of the sea and whose navies were now, strangely enough, united in the supreme effort against her. Trafalgar was furthermore the culmination of the second era of the naval art, the culmination though not the end. As after the Spaniards the Dutch, so, in a smaller way, after the French, a Teutonic race still more closely related to the British than the Hollanders sent out their ships under a flag that John Paul Jones had already made famous on the sea, to seek and fight the ships of England. Not that we should forget, and Professor Rawson neither forgets nor permits his readers to forget, the historical perspective. Our battles of 1812 are placed among the twenty with Lepanto and Trafalgar, but there is no attempt to exaggerate their intrinsic importance. It is not only in the case of America that the author includes fights that are not fleet actions. Indeed it is an avowed object of his to relate doughty deeds upon the sea, whether done by Greek or Roman, by English or Spaniard, by Dutch, Frenchman or his own Americans. One of the great lessons of the book is the comparative uselessness of fine ships and splendid abilities without conspicuous physical and intellectual pluck.

After describing Perry's achievement on Lake Erie, the author ushers in the third and last era of naval warfare, that of steam. He describes the memorable fight between *Monitor* and *Merrimac*, where, as he suggests, two types of ironclads prophesied to the world what the ingenious foes might accomplish when reunited under the olden flag. The duel between the *Kearsarge* and *Alabama* and Farragut's brilliant achievement in Mobile Bay complete the actions chosen from our Civil War. The scene now shifts to the Adriatic and we see the Italians in their fine fleet succumbing to the Austrians, another victory, it is perhaps fair to say, of Teuton over Latin. In Tegetthoff the author is as ready to see great qualities as in Perry or Farragut, and with similar impartiality his next chapter celebrates the valor of Chilians and Peruvians. The last two chapters contain vivid accounts of Manila Bay and Santiago.

The *Twenty Famous Battles* thus ranges over a period of twenty-four centuries. Professor Rawson does not claim to offer considerable additions to the historian's knowledge. He has written a most interesting book, but a book that is intended for a wide class of readers and not, except possibly in the American chapters, for the special student of any period of naval history. He aims simply to tell the story of these sea-fights accurately and vividly, but chiefly from sources generally known, and to impress upon the reader certain fundamental and eternal laws of strategy and tactics, holding up constantly before him the qualities without which no sailor can deserve to win his battles. The author has the facilities of his position for examining governmental naval records, so

that his chapters relating to American history doubtless contain valuable hints for the special investigator. It is perhaps pardonable to express here the hope that the American sailor may never fail to illustrate the high ideals which speak in Professor Rawson's pages.

W. F. TILTON.

A Manual of Church History. By ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History in McMaster University. Vol. I. Ancient and Mediaeval Church History, to A.D. 1517. (Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society. 1900. Pp. xiii, 639.)

THE author here presents in text-book form the results of his twenty years' experience as a student and teacher of ecclesiastical history. His work is thus arranged: an Introduction discusses the nature, method, and divisions of church history, with a history of the discipline. The Graeco-Roman civilization and Judaism are treated as preparatory to Christianity. Period I. (to about 100 A.D.) covers the life of Jesus, the work of the apostles, and the constitution of the apostolic churches; Period II. (to 312 A.D.), the relation of Christianity to the Roman government, the doctrinal development, and the early Christian literature; Period III. (to about 800 A.D.), church and state, theological controversies in the age of the great councils, the growth of the papacy, and various aspects of the Christian world and the Church in the eighth century; Period IV. (to 1517 A.D.) includes a miscellaneous chapter, entitled "Some Aspects of Mediaeval Civilization" (*e. g.*, the Holy Roman Empire, canon law, monasticism, the crusades, the inquisition, universities, scholasticism, and the Renaissance), and chapters on the papacy and various reformatory movements. This, it will be observed, is the familiar, conventional division of the field of church history, which it is so hard for us to get away from. We go on giving to civil rulers, especially to Constantine and Charlemagne, an ecclesiastical significance which they do not deserve, and we fail to understand that the only proper division of the history is into primitive, Catholic and Protestant Christianity.

The merits of Professor Newman's book are that it is clearly written, compact, comprehensive, and well adapted for use in the class-room. It contains extensive bibliographies, from which however one misses here and there an important title, and it is well indexed. The sections which treat of medieval theology, sects and parties, are among the best in the book, yet their arrangement is sometimes poor and the treatment fragmentary. Why are the Taborites (p. 581), the Bohemian Brethren (p. 593), the Hussite movement (p. 607), and the Brethren of the Common Life (p. 617) put in that order, and with other sections sprinkled in between them? And why must we read about the Lollards (p. 589) before we have made the acquaintance of Wyclif (p. 600)? More than once our author lays himself open to the criticism recently passed upon many writers of general history, *viz.* that they give prominence to the ex-

ceptional and picturesque, at the expense of that normal line of progress, which after all constitutes the most important part of history.

Aside from the defects already alluded to, it should be noted that the book before us contains no maps or chronological tables; also that the treatment of church organization, government, discipline and worship is regrettably meagre. The proof-reading might have been more carefully done, and there are occasional slips of a more serious kind, in statements of fact. Yet on the whole Dr. Newman's *Manual* will be welcomed in many institutions where text-books are employed, and it is sure to give better satisfaction than most books of a similar character.

J. WINTHROP PLATNER.

A History of Scotland from the Roman Occupation. By ANDREW LANG. Vol. I. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co. 1900. Pp. xxvi, 509.)

DR. LIEBERMANN has lately been complaining of the tendency of English students of history to produce readable essays rather than to devote themselves to laying the dry foundations upon which a future master may build. In this connection Professor Seeley's denunciation of "mere literature" is remembered. Literature is what Mr. Lang has accustomed us to expect from him, but he now presents himself as a serious and even ambitious writer of history. In this capacity, then, and in no other, must he be judged.

A history of Scotland, at the present stage of historical study in that country, must be one of two things. Either it must be the fruit of a scholar's prolonged and painful study of original sources, or else the discerning and compact restatement of results obtained by specialists working in various parts of the general field. In the first of these classes Mr. Lang's work cannot be included, in the second it probably will not occupy a distinguished place.

The present volume—a second is promised—comprises the period from the Roman occupation to the middle of the sixteenth century. The field is wide, but perhaps less so than would at first appear. The dynastic history of Scotland may be said to have begun with the consolidation of the Celtic—or non-Teutonic, for this point is in dispute—peoples of North Britain under Kenneth MacAlpine (844-860). But the national history of the Scots can scarcely be regarded as older than the battle of Carham (1018), a victorious defeat of the Anglo-Saxons, by which the Northumbrian kings lost the province of Lothian and the Scottish dynasty was swept into the current of Teutonic development. In the succeeding century the marriages of Malcolm Canmore with St. Margaret—a princess of the line of Cerdic and Alfred—and of David I. with that Matilda who, as heiress of Earl Waltheof, brought a dower of claims to an English earldom, definitely mark the triumphs of Teuton over Celt between Tweed and Forth. Thus a Celtic dynasty sprung from an ancestor half Scot half Pict—and so, perhaps, something more

than Celt—reaching southward to add the plains of Lothian to its dominion is, in the course of three generations, conquered in a silent, bloodless struggle which is completed under St. Margaret, by the assimilation of the Scottish Church to Rome. Henceforth the Scottish kingdom will grow north and south from Lothian, striving on the one hand with centripetal England, on the other with centrifugal Pictland.

A new factor is added, in the twelfth century, to the problem of national development. Norman adventurers—the terms are almost convertible—balked in their hope of feudal independence by the vigorous statecraft of the Conqueror and his sons, passed the Border, bringing Norman feudalism into infant Scotland. These Normans and their political ideals found a ready welcome at the hands of David I. and Scotland presently became as feudal as the France of Philip I.

Meanwhile the English government was consolidated and the attempt of Scotland to grow southward at the expense of England failed. But to the north and west Celts and Scandinavians had eventually to give way before the feudal monarchy of the Lowlands.

On a much smaller scale, though without the stimulus of a local throne, much the same process was going on in the marches of Wales where, on terms of high feudal independence, Norman barons were allowed to hold what they could wrest from the hostile Welsh. Regarded from this point of view the history of Scotland up to the death of the Maid of Norway appears rather as a series of unrestrained Norman aggressions resulting in a loose complex of fiefs than, in any true sense, a national history; and this point of view was not unknown to the thirteenth century, for John Hastings, formulating his claim to the Scottish throne—or rather to a share of it—denied that the land was a kingdom, comparing it rather to the great franchises of the Welsh and Scottish Borders.

The War of Independence, of course, evoked a Scottish national consciousness. But the nation which realized itself under so great tribulations was cast in a feudal mould, a community in which the notion of contract as the principle of national cohesion was still strong.

From this point of view accordingly the drama—say rather the tragedy—of the growth of the Scottish nation will be criticized in a manner differing materially from that followed by Mr. Lang. Care will be taken to guard against too early an introduction of the notions of patriotism on the one hand and treachery on the other. The turbulent barons who rise against their king are not always fighting for “one national idea, Independence” (p. 269); nor when, like Douglas (pp. 263, 364), they desert him, is the idea of a dissolution of contract wholly absent.

So much, then, for the point of view. Mr. Lang’s story is painstaking but somewhat languid; he needs a battle to rouse him. His accounts of the Battle of the Standard, of Bannockburn and of Flodden Field are clear and spirited, but they shine by contrast with the listless narrative in which they are set.

The constitutional history of Scotland remains to be written. To the achievement of this desirable end Mr. Lang’s work is in no sense a

contribution. His constitutional history is literary—not to say journalistic. He has relied on the works of Robertson, Skene and Innes, drawing freely, for analogies—which he sometimes regards as proof—upon the writings of Bishop Stubbs and Professor Maitland. These authorities, unfortunately, he has not always read with care. He is capable, for example, of likening Celtic tribal land held in common ownership to the Anglo-Saxon *folcland* of Kemble's dreams (p. 82), although Vinogradoff's teaching has reached him through Maitland (p. 86). Again he writes of peers of the realm in the eleventh century (p. 94) and of "the important statute *de tallagio non concedendo*" (p. 185). On the intricate question of boroughs (p. 145 and App. D.) an amateur is less to be blamed for going wrong, but if Mr. Lang had consulted Professor Maitland's *Township and Borough* he would have seen that the views advanced in *Domesday Book and Beyond* have not passed unquestioned. An understanding of the nature of tallage would have resolved the difficulty raised (p. 147) by the burghal contribution to the ransom of William the Lion. This lack of training is further betrayed in the application of the title of Dauphin to the heir of Philip Augustus (p. 119), and in the ingenuous belief implied on page 253 that the Lex Salica provides that women shall not succeed to the crown of France.

A few misprints have also been remarked. *Henry II.* for *Henry I.* (p. 128), *Carlaverock* for *Caerlaverock* (pp. xxi, 189), *Lorraine* for *Lorraine* (p. 308).

On the whole one fails to understand why, with Mr. Hume Brown's excellent work already in the field, the present book should have been put forth.

GAILLARD THOMAS LAPSLEY.

The County Palatine of Durham. A Study in Constitutional History.

By GAILLARD THOMAS LAPSLEY, Ph.D. (New York and London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1900. Pp. xii, 380.)

THE author well calls his book A Study; each chapter is a particular study of its field. It is only as a series of studies that so much of detail as constantly appears can find justification. Investigation in detail is of course the sort of work expected in the Harvard Historical Studies, to which the subject of this review belongs. Had the work been published as a history, it would have been open, on this point, to obvious criticism, which the author's modesty and good sense have disarmed. The distinction is worth drawing and emphasizing, and Dr. Lapsley deserves thanks for observing it and so helping it on.

But this praise must itself be seasoned with criticism. Surely there is a distinction between the work of the antiquary and that of the student of constitutional history. The pursuit of details as such is not the work of the latter; and one would not have to go far to feel that the author has sometimes lost his place. The origin of the Durham palatinate in the darkness of pre-Norman England has possibly some value in consti-

tutional history ; but to spend almost the best part of the book, the first thirty pages, in wandering about for what only the antiquary would sufficiently value when found, might tempt one to cast aside a first-rate piece of work. Five pages should have been enough.

Let us have done with criticism at once. How could the author devote these thirty pages to the Origin of the Palatinate, and, without a helpful syllable, dismiss a court of the Law Merchant, which he finds in Durham in full operation? "A court of pie-powder was held in the fairs and markets belonging to the bishop ;" but that and other small courts "present no peculiar features." The author is nodding ; one so learned in legal history must know that the smallest word unearthed about these courts of the merchants is worth tons of suggestions and guesses, or even of records, in regard to the origin of the Durham palatinate. Thence came (transplanted from the Continent) the body of that most potent influence in English and American life, our *lex mercatoria*. Will not Dr. Lapsley tell us something about the pie-powder courts of Durham, as well as about the Council of the North?

For another thing, we cannot but wonder why the author should stop, as he does several times, to justify his method. An author is entitled to his own method ; the only justification called for is its fruits. On that justification Dr. Lapsley might safely have rested, quite as safely as by challenging the reader to consider his method. Again, the author is apt to discredit his reader's intelligence ; as where, after giving (p. 234) two reasons for a certain thing, which tell their own story, he comments thus : "The first is a matter of expediency, the second a matter of sentiment."

We had noted other things for criticism, but we gladly brush them away, with all that we have said, as only the small dust in the balance. The merits of the work before us are conspicuous, its defects of the slightest in comparison. The idea of making the Durham palatinate a special study was a happy one ; but for some other workers we might call it an inspiration. It was worth doing, and has been well done.

The scope of the work is comprehensive, and the plan is so well carried out that Lapsley's *Durham Palatinate* must long stand as the final work on the subject. What it contains may be briefly shown.

After the first chapter, on origins, we have a careful study on The Bishop as Lord Palatine. Here the author treats of the Bishop's regality, under powers *in imperio*, *in dominio*, and *in jurisdictione* ; a not very illuminating set of titles, though the author assures us that it "has in compensation the great advantage of clearness." Under the first designation the Bishop appears as king of Durham ; under the second, as feudal landlord ; under the third, in relation to the law.

The second chapter treats of the less interesting subject of the Officers of the Palatinate ; under which we find Officers of State and Officers of the Household fully dealt with.

A valuable chapter follows on The Assembly and the Bishop's Council, which all students of our own colonial history will read with pleasure

and profit. We have in this connection, first, the Development of the Assembly, then the Composition and Functions of that body; following which we have a like treatment of the Council, and other matters of interest pertaining to that branch of the palatinate.

The fifth and sixth chapters are, for us, the best in the book. The fifth chapter opens indeed, like the book itself, with a vain thing, a too serious delay over the Development of the Judiciary from 635 until 1195; at which latter date, or a little before, under the reforms of Henry the Second, the subject really begins. From that time on the author easily carries the interested reader through a long category of courts, until he reaches the pie-powder tribunals—of which no more. The Transition from a Feudal to a Royal Court is well told. The sixth chapter treats of the Palatine Courts in relation to the Royal Judiciary, and leaves nothing to be desired; a surprise to a lawyer, because the author himself does not profess to be a man of law. Here will be found all the details of judicial procedure, much of it extremely technical, and all of it, so far as we have observed, accurate. It is curious, by the way, that the author missed the chance, on page 218, of remarks on foreign attachment. "It is questionable," says Dr. Lapsley, "whether the bishop could have been put to exigent or outlawed on such proceedings," proceedings in the nature of foreign attachment. Could a citizen of Massachusetts be proceeded against personally, on attachment of lands of his in New York, without service of process on him? Chapter VI. closes with some useful remarks in regard to the Council of the North and the Palatine Judiciary, a subject of which the author has since shown himself a master. Here the author accordingly deals with what theologians, in another way, call last things. He is speaking of a plea of land in the palatinate drawn in 1547 into the (royal) Council, and closes with a passage which we must quote. "This tells the whole story. In the administration of law the palatinate has become a negligible quantity. It is not destroyed or swept away; that would have been inconsistent with the genius of the English race, which is before all things conservative of appearances; but the life that was in it has gone. . . . The living organism with which we were concerned has become a heap of dry bones."

The final chapters deal with Financial, and Military and Naval, Arrangements in the Palatinate. Several appendices of considerable value follow, the last one a full bibliography.

We have read this book with genuine satisfaction. The Torrey Fund, which is responsible for the publication of it, has borne no better fruit.

MELVILLE MADISON BIGELOW.

The History of Edward the Third (1327-1377). By JAMES MACKINNON, Ph.D. (London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1900. Pp. xx, 624.)

DR. MACKINNON'S book is based on laborious and independent investigation of sources. No phase of the reign is entirely neglected, but

he deals chiefly with military history. He excels Longman and Warburton in accuracy of statement, corrects chronological errors of various writers, and treats certain periods of Scottish history with a fulness of detail never before attempted. His account of the battle of Neville's Cross is based partly upon a source heretofore used by no English writer, and the narrative of events in Scotland for the decade after Halidon Hill deserves especial mention for its novelty. Such are the chief merits of the volume. They are due, in part, to priority in the use of Lettenhove's Froissart.

Apparently Dr. Mackinnon has not employed all available contemporary materials. Certain minor chroniclers are not cited, and no evidence exists that the author has consulted the important Calendars of Close and Patent Rolls. A specific bibliography is lacking.

The opening sentence of the preface states: "In writing this work I have limited myself to the investigation of contemporary evidence." It is a pity the assertion is so true. How much the author could have learned from recent writers is evidenced, for example, by his description of the battle of Dupplin Moor. He ascribes the victory of the English to the "courage of despair" and "the idiocy of Mar and his ill-disciplined rabble;" of the significance of English archery tactics, he has never a word to say. Again, with reference to the battle of Poitiers, he names with evident pride the authorities by whose use he has "departed considerably from the conventional descriptions of previous historians." He does not seem to know that by the "careful examination" of these same authorities Mr. Oman had already written an account of the battle better, because more critical and less dogmatic, than his own.

The favorable reception accorded Dr. Mackinnon's work on the *Union of England and Scotland* can hardly be extended in its fulness to the present publication. Apart from Scottish annals, it contains too little which is new. Much of the military history, and all the constitutional history, has been handled as well or better elsewhere; the religious and economic features of the reign are portrayed essentially along familiar lines; and the character of Edward himself, as man and sovereign, stands out but little more clearly as the result of Dr. Mackinnon's analysis.

Regarding the warriors of the time as "picturesque fighting maniacs," he abhors chivalry. This sharp contrast between the spirit of the author and one prominent manifestation of the spirit of the age apparently leads him to adopt a style of cheap sarcasm and railing mockery which too often falls below the standard of historical dignity and defaces with vulgarisms page after page of his work. The infiltration of modern humanitarian ideals and the use of the nineteenth-century interpretation of the rights of nationalities as a test for the acts of the fourteenth, detract greatly from the value of the book.

OLIVER H. RICHARDSON.

Michel de l'Hospital. Being the Lothian Prize Essay, 1899. By C. T. ATKINSON, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford; late Demy of Magdalen College. (London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1900. Pp. viii, 200.)

THE important part taken by the great Chancellor in the exciting drama of the French political and religious struggles of the sixteenth century amply justifies the production of this little book, and might have warranted the composition of a still larger work. In the madness of the contending parties, l'Hospital perhaps above all others strove to hold a position of serene impartiality and imperturbable conviction that in the end righteousness would win the day. "Patience, patience, all will come out aright," was his frequently repeated motto. That it did not, was no fault of his sagacity, but the result of circumstances beyond his control.

Mr. Atkinson has told with care and with accuracy the story of the short but eventful period to which his activity was limited. He has added to the picture as usually drawn some traits derived from a particular study of the Chancellor's own works, which are, however, of limited scope. More that is striking has been obtained from the recently published volumes of Hector de la Ferrière devoted to the letters of Catharine de' Medici, forming part of the magnificent *Collection de Documents Inédits* issued by the French government. The result is a compact volume which will prove serviceable not less as a sketch of the course of events in the reign of Francis II. and the first years of Charles IX. than as a partial biography of l'Hospital. We rise from a careful perusal of it confirmed in the impression of the perfect honesty and integrity of the Chancellor and of the misfortune it was to France that from the very first he was engaged in a hopeless endeavor. This is much, even if Mr. Atkinson has not made any sensible addition to our stock of knowledge on this point. He well observes that "the clue to all l'Hospital's measures and to his general policy is to be found in his absolute identification of religion, justice and toleration. He was just because he was religious, he was tolerant because he was just." Yet, strange to say, neither friends nor enemies were agreed as to what l'Hospital's particular religious views were. His wife, daughter and son-in-law were all Huguenots, but he certainly was not a Huguenot, not even a crypto-Huguenot. Mr. Atkinson enthusiastically finds "ample justification in his works for the conclusion that l'Hospital was no bigoted Catholic but no Calvinist, still less an atheist—a Catholic rather than a Huguenot, if one must place him on one side or the other, but above all a sincere and devout Christian" (p. 173).

Mr. Atkinson's style is simple and unadorned. He tells the tale he has taken in hand without over-great excitement; so quietly in fact as to appear unmoved by its thrilling incidents. The language is that of every-day life and we are scarcely surprised at the use of expressions approaching contemporary slang. On page 84 we read that religion was

the principal "plank" in the Reformers' "platform," and a few lines farther on we are informed that l'Hospital increased the number of his enemies daily "by his stern opposition to anything in the nature of a job."

We fear that many may be deterred from reading this excellent book by what we cannot avoid regarding as an injudicious incorporation in the text of whole clauses and frequently long sentences in foreign languages. A good stiff quotation in Latin or French even when relegated to a footnote will startle your easy-going reader when descried from afar. What will become of his composure if he runs directly against a brace of lines in the very sentence he has entered upon and finds no room for retreat, so that he must needs grapple with their difficulties or ignominiously succumb? For example, page 100 seems written expressly for readers familiar with the old French. Out of its twenty-four lines, full ten are in that tongue, the citations being distributed in three or four sentences. In not one case would the foreign words lose force by translation into English.

HENRY M. BAIRD.

A History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth, 1640-1660. By WILLIAM A. SHAW. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1900. Two vols., pp. xxxvi, 384, 707.)

OLD writers upon Puritan history devoted their pages to a record of the sufferings of their heroes and heroines, an account of their persecutions at home and of their battles abroad, and an apology for their opinions and beliefs. They had much to say about what was done to the Puritans and about what the Puritans themselves would do, but of what they actually accomplished little was written. Mr. Shaw's book represents a very different type of history. It is neither a record of the struggles of sect with sect nor is it an account of different forms of religious doctrine, but it is a history of what the author calls the most complete and drastic revolution which the Church of England has ever undergone, a history of the development of the Puritan ecclesiastical polity.

For the writing of the history of this ecclesiastical revolution no one was better fitted than Mr. Shaw. In 1890 he edited for the Chetham Society the *Minutes of the Manchester Presbyterian Classis*, the most perfect of surviving records of Presbyterianism under the Commonwealth, and in 1896 the *Minutes of the Bury Classis*. In the same period he also edited the proceedings of the Plundered Ministers' Committee for the Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society, and now, in several appendices, he has set down all the cases of clergymen tried, imprisoned, sequestered, ejected, nominated, or promoted to benefices by the various parliamentary committees for deprived clergymen, for plundered ministers, for scandalous ministers, for reformation of the universities, etc., recorded in the *Commons' Journals* and *Lords' Journals*. More than

that, he has brought together from various sources and printed for the first time a mass of material relating to the constitution of the Presbyterian system, accounts of first-fruits and of tenths, and sales of bishops' lands and of deans' and chapters' lands. In short, while confining himself to publishing definitely chosen parts of such materials as are never likely to be published in Calendar form or by the Historical Manuscripts Commission, he has made accessible a body of material which, together with a future Calendar of Plundered Ministers' Records, will constitute a complete body of evidence upon the history of the ecclesiastical revolution of the seventeenth century, a body of evidence of value both to the general historian and to the parochial historian.

But the best evidence of the value of the material in these appendices is to be seen in the use which the author has made of them, with other sources, in the reconstruction of the history of the period. Since the time of Carlyle we have been inclined to exaggerate the importance of the military history of the time. The author of this book, however, does not make that mistake. Instead, he emphasizes the fact that the history of Puritanism was in the first place the history of thought, of divinity,—perhaps we may say, polemical divinity. In the Stuart period England took the second step in the nationalization of the church. Henry VIII. had cut it off from Rome. Now the people adopted it, and the offices of the church and membership in the church became elective. The question of the divine right of kings was accordingly of less importance than that of the divine right of bishops and presbyters, and the power of officers of the church a matter of less serious concern than their virtue, albeit the Puritan was duly impressed with the incompatibility of power and virtue.

But while Puritanism was first of all doctrinal, and while Puritan doctrine was logical and systematic as long as it remained merely academic as in Elizabethan Presbyterianism, or merely clerical as in Covenanting Presbyterianism, it afterwards became popular, and among the people Puritanism meant not only ecclesiastical doctrine but political theory, and popular doctrine and popular theories were not logical or systematic; they were inspired, perhaps, by hatred of Rome rather than by love of God, they were critical rather than constructive. Men drew up catalogues of sins with ease, but the conversion of England, they discovered, was a more difficult matter. Indeed, the people of England would have been content to remain in that wicked Babylon, as some called episcopacy, had not the Scots urged Presbyterianism upon them as the price of their assistance against the victorious king.

The first plan of ecclesiastical reform had been Ussher's, a plan of modified episcopacy. This provided for parochial presbyteries, rural deaneries with monthly synods, dioceses with semi-annual synods, and provinces with triennial synods. The Parliamentary plan, however, was for the government of the church by commissions appointed by Parliament as bishops had been appointed by the King, a chief commission to succeed to the archiepiscopal jurisdiction and county commissions to succeed to the episcopal. But the clergy were unwilling to be responsi-

ble to either King or Parliament, and at the same time the Scotch complained of the slowness of the reformation of religion in England, surmising that God had some quarrel with England; so, finally, Parliament called an Assembly of Divines to sit at Westminster and settle the affairs of the Church. The Assembly plan of church government became the frame of the Church of the Commonwealth, the Directory for Public Worship supplanted the Book of Common Prayer, and the Confession of Faith superseded the Thirty-nine Articles. In place of the spiritual courts were substituted Presbyterian assemblies, a congregational eldership to meet once a week, a classis once a month, a provincial assembly twice a year and a national assembly at the summons of Parliament, constituted of two ministers and four elders from each provincial assembly, as the provincial assembly was constituted of two ministers and four elders from each classis. In fact, the state was re-organized upon an ecclesiastical basis. The presbytery took cognizance of the morals of the congregation, held investigations in regular form, and decreed punishment by suspension, and the Houses of Parliament called laymen to their bar for disturbances in churches, for holding conventicles, or for absenting themselves from their parish churches, or for preaching when not ordained.

These are a few of the points more or less familiar, which the author discusses judiciously and thoroughly, so judiciously and thoroughly, in fact, that there seems to us to be no other work except that of Robert Barclay with which to compare it. It marks an epoch in the development of our knowledge of the Commonwealth Church—Presbyterian it may popularly be called—as Barclay's work marked an epoch in our knowledge of the obscurer sects of the same period.

W. DAWSON JOHNSTON.

The Memoirs of the Baroness Cécile de Courtot, Lady-in-Waiting to the Princess de Lamballe. Compiled, from the Letters of the Baroness to Frau von Alvensleben, and the Diary of the Latter, by her Great-grandson MORITZ VON KAISENBERG. Translated from the German by Jessie Haynes. (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1900. Pp. xiv, 298.)

THE authenticity of this book stands sadly in need of proof. This is not furnished by the preface, which arouses only suspicion. The compiler asserts that in the attic of his father's house in the neighborhood of Halberstadt there stood an ancient carved oak chest and that he, delving in it one day, found not only ivory fans, potpourri boxes, ladies' poetry albums, illuminated prayer-books, costumes and fashion-plates, but quite at the bottom "chanced upon a thick packet of letters tied together with a blue ribbon and having on the outside wrapper the inscription 'Cécile's Letters. 1801 and 1802.'" These letters, seventeen in number, written by the Baroness to her German friend, Frau von Alvensleben, purport to describe French conditions and important personages in the

years named but are hardly wide enough in scope to make a book. Fortunately our editor finds at the same moment "a red velvet book," the diary of this Frau von Alvensleben, which contains many of Cécile's oral descriptions of the Revolutionary events she witnessed. The range of contemporary information is thus happily widened, covering the years 1789-1803. This is all the authentication vouchsafed us by the compiler.

Nor does internal evidence increase our confidence. The chronology of this book is in a frightful welter, being either vague, impossible, or self-contradictory. The Baroness Cécile informs us that in July 1783, being then "just twenty," she became lady-in-waiting to the Princess de Lamballe, then living in Savoy (p. 44), that thus "a year went by," that then a letter came from Marie Antoinette asking the Princess to join her at court, which she and the Baroness immediately did. Yet Marie Antoinette's letter is dated June 12, 1783 (p. 48). Furthermore we are told on page 57 that in 1784 the two ladies had been at court "about a year."

The matter is already troublesome but it becomes far more complicated when Cécile asserts on page 256 that in July, 1783, being then "nearly seventeen," she chanced to be visiting near Brienne, that one evening wandering away from the villa into the fields she suddenly heard an infuriated bellow behind her and turning round "saw to my horror that an enormous black bull, irritated perhaps by my red parasol, was bearing down upon me with blazing eyes and lowered horns." The moment was tense but her life was saved by a "pale-faced boy," wearing the uniform of the Brienne cadets, who, running to the rescue, pierced the brute's eye with his sword and sent him "staggering blindly about the field." It is of course superfluous to remark that this pale-faced boy was none other than Napoleon Bonaparte, who, we know from other sources, was then fourteen years of age. A year later, 1784, the Baroness was once more at Brienne giving a laurel wreath to her "youthful hero" on the occasion of the annual examination of the cadets (pp. 258-259).

It is in connection with the revolutionary calendar that many of the most striking novelties of this book occur. Cécile starts on a journey from the heart of Brandenburg to Paris. Her first letter to her friend is dated Cassel, October 25, 1801. Her second (p. 158 *seq.*) is dated Strassburg, 3 Brumaire, Year X., and in it she states that she "arrived here the day before yesterday." The art of verifying dates must be lightly regarded by the maker of this book for, curiously enough, 3 Brumaire Year X., translated into English, is precisely October 25, 1801. This kind of retroactive travelling baffles the reviewer.

The dates of the sixth and seventh letters (pp. 186 and 190) transferred from the revolutionary calendar are Dec. 6, 1801 and Dec. 24, 1802, yet the context plainly implies an interval of only a few weeks. The author apparently does not fully understand the range of the Years X. and XI., for the Year XI. is evidently considered synchronous with 1802, whereas ten of the eleven letters dated that year fall within 1803

(8th to 17th inclusive). Yet that 1802 is intended is shown by the dates on pp. 289-290, expressed in terms of the Gregorian calendar.

The chronology of the editorial notes is as dubious as that of the letters and diary. On page 140 we find the date 25 Nivôse, the editor explaining parenthetically that that was February 19, 1800, whereas our tables show that it was January 15. He is also plainly under the impression that Vendémiaire follows rather than precedes Brumaire in the French calendar (p. 139).

These unusual memoirs close in a tumultuous tangle of dates which leaves the reader in the most hopeless consternation. Cécile in a letter to her friend, dated 7 Floréal XI. (April 27, 1803), refers to a coming family event (p. 289). This event occurred, as an editorial note informs us, July 11, 1802, when a child was born to the von Alvenslebens (p. 289). On the same day Mademoiselle Cécile was married in Paris. After the wedding and after hearing of the arrival of the boy (as the contents of the letter show) she writes her German friend. The date given is 12 Messidor, the year lacking. 12 Messidor is July 1. The year could not have been 1802 for neither the marriage nor the birth of her friend's child had then taken place. Nor could it have been 1803, for we find Frau von Alvensleben recording in her diary on June 10, 1802, the news of the death of her friend Cécile on 28 Floréal (May 18).

In the presence of chronological wonders like these the attention is not arrested by minor marvels such as Cécile's assertion that as a child she used constantly to be given toys by Talleyrand "while he was still Bishop of Autun," he being an intimate family friend (p. 203). Talleyrand was made Bishop of Autun in 1789. In 1781 Cécile had been presented at court and had made her début in society (p. 44) and since 1783 she had been lady-in-waiting to Princess de Lamballe. Or again this other statement (p. 197) in a letter dated December 24, 1802, that she is unable just now to have the interview she desires with Talleyrand "as he has not yet returned from Lunéville where he is drawing up the final conditions of the Peace." Now the treaty of Lunéville was concluded February 9, 1801. Furthermore it was negotiated by Joseph Bonaparte and not by Talleyrand.

It must also be admitted that it requires no little boldness to make Marie Antoinette write at length to Princess de Lamballe on August 10, 1792, of all days in her career, when, as may be safely asserted in view of our minute knowledge of the events of that day, she could do no such thing. Furthermore the character of the letter itself confirms us in our lack of confidence in its authenticity (pp. 65-66).

We must also protest against the ragged French the Queen is made responsible for in the several letters published here and ascribed to her (pp. 48, 52, 65-66, 68 and particularly 113 and 114-115). Here we have feminine nouns accompanied by both masculine and feminine verb-endings and we observe the Queen addressing her sister in the plural form at the opening of the sentence and in the singular at the close, the sentence being just eleven words in length (p. 113).

On the whole this is one of the most feebly constructed books we remember ever to have read, the tone of reality lacking throughout. And, what in fiction is unpardonable, it is dull, with the exception of the fourteenth letter, which shows much brilliancy of imagination in its portrayal of Napoleon, whose biography must be rewritten in important particulars if the statements made here are true. We have not been accustomed to hear the First Consul speak of his youthful days at Brienne as "the only really happy ones" he ever knew.

CHARLES D. HAZEN.

Correspondance de Le Coz, Évêque Constitutionnel d'Ille-et-Vilaine.

Publiée pour la Société d'Histoire Contemporaine. Par le P. ROUSSEL, de l'Oratoire. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1900. Pp. xiv, 430.)

THIS is the latest of a series of over twenty volumes, published by the Society during the last eight years, comprising documents relating to the French Revolution. This volume consists of 176 letters written from November, 1790, to May, 1802, preceded by a brief biography by the editor. The letters throw much light on the ecclesiastical and social conditions of the period. The relation of the constitutional clergy to the papacy is not clearly brought out, and we suspect that some letters and other documents on this subject have been omitted.

The writer, Claude Le Coz, was a member of the Assembly of 1791-1792, one of the few bishops who had taken the oath to support the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, and a leader in the constitutional church. Although lenient toward the clergy who had refused the oath, and desiring peace with them, he was distinguished for his liberal and independent ideas, defended the position of the constitutional clergy against the Pope himself, and accused Pius VI. of having provoked a religious war because the latter had excommunicated the constitutional clergy instead of trying to make peace between those who had taken and those who had refused the oath. Le Coz was a zealous partisan of Napoleon, whom he lauds to the skies, and from whom, even as First Consul, he expects every good for the Church. On account of his charities he was called the Father of the Poor.

Le Coz was born in 1740 in a village in eastern Bretagne and educated in a school of the Jesuits at Quimper, where, shortly after their expulsion in 1762, he held the position of principal until 1791. In February, 1791, he took the oath of submission to the Constitution and joined the ranks of the *assermentés*. About this time the electoral assembly of Ille-et-Vilaine deposed the bishop of Rennes on account of his refusal to take the oath, and elected Le Coz in his place. After some hesitation and a very courteous letter to the former bishop and a very respectful announcement to the Pope, he accepted and was consecrated at Paris in April. In September he was elected a deputy to the Legislative Assembly, where he made several speeches and served until the close of the session in September, 1792. During this period we

have twenty-two letters addressed to the administrators of the department which he represented, giving a vivid and interesting account of the occurrences of that eventful year.

In 1793 Christian worship was proscribed throughout France, and in September, refusing to renounce his orders, Le Coz was imprisoned by Carrier, one of the most bitter and cruel persecutors, who was executed in December, 1794, for excessive and lawless cruelty. Le Coz spent over a year in prison, suffering many hardships and indignities which he describes in his letters to his friends. Released in December, 1794, he returned to Rennes only to find his house stripped of furniture and church ornaments, though his library of 4,000 volumes was saved. From this time begins an interesting series of fifty-six letters, to Grégoire, Bishop of Loir-et-Cher, at Blois, the leader of the constitutional clergy. These letters show an earnest, independent spirit, eager for peace with the *insermentés* and for the restoration of friendly relations with the papacy. They tell of struggles against great difficulties, suspicion, ill-feeling, desertion, hunger and poverty due to the rapid depreciation of the *assignats* and loss of property. They describe the ravages of the Chouans and give some interesting allusions to the influence of English deism and atheism on French writers.

For a long time Le Coz did not dare to go outside the city, and it was not until June, 1797, that he made his first episcopal visitation, when he beheld on every side the traces of civil war. In 1797 and again in 1801 he presided at the national church council held at Paris. His letters to Grégoire and others at this period show the desolation and difficulties of the church, the strenuous efforts he is making for peace and quiet, the terrible moral and social effects of the irreligion and lawlessness, and the need of some strong hand to subdue the disorder and lead the nation into peace.

After the council of 1801 he remained in Paris to look after the interests of the constitutional church. With the other clergy generally he resigned his position in October as a preliminary to the approaching settlement under the Concordat. He was soon after appointed Archbishop of Besançon and wrote to Cardinal Caprara for the bull of institution. He entered his see in May, 1802. Here the letters cease. In 1804 he went to Paris for the consecration of Napoleon and while there he had several audiences with the Pope, to whom he gave in his formal adherence in December.

He was one of the first to declare for Napoleon in March, 1815, but died on a visitation in May of that same year.

CHARLES L. WELLS.

An Outline of Political Growth in the Nineteenth Century. By EDMUND HAMILTON SEARS, A.M., Principal of Mary Institute, Saint Louis. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1900. Pp. xiii, 616.)

THE result aimed at by Professor Sears in this volume is to "awaken an interest in political study and create a desire for a fuller knowledge of

the progress of democracy." The interpretation of the word "political" as used in the title is very broad. The work "is not a mere record of political facts and constitutional changes. Indeed, it would be difficult to define a political fact. . . . Among the progressive nations all historic events have in the end a political significance; for out of them arises the whole framework of government and constitutional life. . . . Accordingly the present treatise deals with all the varied events and happenings that make up the story of a nation's life." Nevertheless the work contains much less of things which are not in the stricter sense political than this announcement would lead one to expect. At another point Professor Sears says that it is the story of "the successive triumphs of popular institutions" that he wishes to tell. His theme is, therefore, the growth of democracy. It may be remarked here that, while Professor Sears is not always in sympathy with the aims and methods of democracy in particular, in democracy in general he professes the utmost faith.

Geographically the work includes every country in the world where the author has discovered political growth—in some, it may be, only political disturbance. Every country is treated separately with completeness, but there is a grouping of nations, mainly on the basis of racial kinship. Book I. deals with continental Europe and has three divisions: Part I., "The Latin Nations"; Part II., "Southeastern Europe and Russia"; Part III., "The Teutonic Nations." Book II. treats of Great Britain and her colonies; Book III. of the United States; Book IV. of Spanish and Portuguese America; Book V. of "Unclassified Countries," including Liberia, Haiti, Santo Domingo, Japan, India and Siam.

The arrangement is faulty in some measure in that it is not the logical order of the growth of democracy. The author emphasizes national growth in the view that most writers neglect this for general movements and tendencies. The result is that international affairs, and movements wider than national, are not so clearly and systematically handled as matters purely national. There is more or less interdependence between the separate portions, but that which goes before is, as often as otherwise, dependent on that which comes after, and, though there are a limited number of cross-references, it would be a decided gain if they were more freely used. The European portion gives us a pretty clear though brief account of the development in each nation, though means and processes are often left, it seems, in unnecessary obscurity.

The part on the United States is necessary to completeness according to the design of the work, but it would not be difficult to find among the numerous brief histories of the United States a much better account.

It is hardly justifiable, even from the author's own point of view, that India should be dismissed with a treatment scarcely longer than that of San Marino or Andorra.

The author usually endeavors to be fair, but his own opinions are frequently more prominent than the unbiassed presentation of facts. For example, the followers of Mr. Bryan in the last presidential campaign are

condemned out of the mouths of their enemies. The style of the work is sufficiently forcible, and without doubt the volume will prove interesting as well as instructive to the general reader, as the author hoped. Properly used it may be made serviceable as a text-book. It remains to be added that Professor Sears makes no claim to original investigation. He has made wide use of standard authorities and magazine articles, and has usually worked over his material with care. The book ends with a useful bibliography of twenty-three pages.

EDMUND C. BURNETT.

Napoleon's Invasion of Russia. By HEREFORD B. GEORGE, Fellow of New College, Oxford. (London: T. Fisher Unwin; New York: New Amsterdam Book Co. 1899. Pp. xvi, 451.)

THIS handsome volume, whose paper, type, maps and general get-up need no praise, is a distinct addition to the discussion of the downward course of the greatest man of modern times. Having read his authorities conscientiously, but rejecting some valuable testimony, Mr. George relies mainly on Chambray, Jomini and Clausewitz, all of whom served through the 1812 campaign, on Buturlin, the Russian official historian, and on Napoleon's correspondence. Secure of his facts, he gives us an easily understood narrative of the campaign; while, writing for an English audience, he naturally lays more stress on Napoleon's desire to "make war on England on the Vistula" than perhaps the true perspective of history warrants. "It was Napoleon's intense desire to crush England which took him to Moscow," says he. The main cause of Napoleon's antagonism to Russia seems to our author to have been its failure to lay an embargo on English goods; and with honest British spirit, when quoting bulletins or letters, he lays undue stress upon the Emperor's "mendacity." The unwilling vassalage of Prussia and the reluctant aid of Austria, as well as their secret anti-French understanding, are much dwelt upon, and the promises held out to Poland to secure its aid: yet these countries were allies on whom Napoleon had a right, from a military standpoint, to count. That Napoleon could hold together the motley host of 630,000 men with which he advanced on Russia, was due, Mr. George maintains, to his admirable corps commanders—but these men were strictly of Napoleon's creation.

The Emperor's projecting half a million men into a country so sparsely settled that it could scarce sustain an invading army of 50,000 was an experiment which earlier in life he would not have undertaken, or into which he would have infused so much more of his own individuality that he might have succeeded. But he was no longer the slim, nervously active, omnipresent man; he was corpulent, liked his ease and shunned bad weather. Except for the migratory invasions of peoples, no such force had ever yet been put into one campaign. Alexander had commanded not more than 135,000 men; Hannibal 60,000; Cæsar 80,000, and Gustavus less; while Frederick rarely saw 50,000 men in one body

under his colors. When we consider the small army that a one-track railroad, apart from other means, is thought to be able to supply over a distance of fifty miles, the task in trackless Russia may be partly gauged. Charles XII.'s failure could not deter such a man as Napoleon ; nor was the campaign too bold for him at his best. It had in fact to be undertaken if he would not lose his prestige.

The Emperor's original idea was to make two campaigns unless peace came sooner—the first year's to Smolensk, the next to Moscow and St. Petersburg. But he was insensibly led on to crowd more into 1812 than could possibly be accomplished if luck should run counter to him. When he reached Smolensk, and there, by his own default, failed to beat the Russians in such a fashion as to throw them off their line of retreat and to cripple their army, the campaign was practically lost ; and to continue the march to Moscow was unnecessarily to invite disaster. The diluted victory at Smolensk was the turning-point ; even the Napoleon of 1805 could not then have saved the campaign ; it was the poker-player's instinct which carried him beyond.

When Kutusov sustained at Borodino the bloodiest defeat of modern days, Napoleon was still worse off, for the French were losing their preponderance with every league ; and when, in hopeless anticipation that the Czar would come to terms, Napoleon delayed a month longer in Moscow than was safe, it was his lost ability to gauge facts, his disbelief in failure, bred of the stupendous successes of the past, which lay at the root of his indecisiveness. With the same old mental grasp, he was in character no longer the same man.

All this Mr. George sets down so clearly as to give us a crisp view of the advance, the battles and the horrible retreat. His style is easy and the maps suffice for the general reader. But he is distinctly hypercritical. To the true Briton Napoleon remains a real evil, not a mere historical character, to be calmly weighed in the balance, and he likes not to allow him overmuch credit. As a matter of fact, Napoleon was the most useful man of the century just closing. Had it not been that, in hostility to his arch-opponents, the monarchs of Europe, Napoleon spread abroad some measure of freedom, it is doubtful whether there would be any instinct of liberty on the Continent to-day. Someone had to mold into form the chaotic ideas of the new departure made by the French Revolution, and it may be doubted whether anyone could have done so better than Napoleon.

The Russian Campaign, in conception, was far from being as wild a scheme as Mr. George considers it. Should an Oriental, unfamiliar with the momentous twenty years from 1796 to 1815, read this book, he might almost draw the conclusion that Napoleon was a man of less than common power, sense and judgment, instead of being in our days what Cæsar was to antiquity. In this the work lacks a strength it would otherwise possess ; but in all else it can be commended.

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

The Puritan Republic of the Massachusetts Bay in New England.

By DANIEL WAIT HOWE. (Indianapolis: The Bowen-Merrill Company. 1899. Pp. xxxviii, 422.)

A CURIOUS and interesting feature of this book is that it comes from the Middle West. Manufactured in Brooklyn, New York, it appears or is published at Indianapolis. The author treats of "some of the features of the Massachusetts Puritan Commonwealth that I thought would be most interesting to the people of to-day, and especially to those who are descendants of the early Puritans" (p. x.). He is not satisfied with the tendencies and drift of modern historians, whom he arraigns in this wise: "the unsparing censure of modern writers, notably of some in Massachusetts, whose cardinal idea seems to be that we magnify ourselves in proportion as we belittle our ancestors. In the writings of this new school the history of the Puritan age in Massachusetts is delineated as a dreary waste" (p. 393). In other connections he refers more directly to the offenders, Mr. John Fiske, Mr. Charles Francis Adams and others, whose work has established itself. Such criticism, if it would attain a historic basis, should be sustained by definite rebuttal of the offending matter; which does not appear. At many points we have the altercation of debate, with hardly any digesting of proofs.

In his incomplete attempt to define theocratic principles and methods (pp. 194-199), as well as in other developments of his theme, the author renders himself liable to Mr. Burke's famous saying, concerning the limitations of legal education and practice. For example, he says if "the Massachusetts Commonwealth had been filled by Roger Williams, Gorton, Coddington and the motley brood that flocked to the shores of Narragansett Bay, we should have had a grotesque conglomeration that, for a time, might have assumed the semblance of a government, of which possibly the chief features might have been religious and political toleration." . . .

Inasmuch as the foundations of civil government and religious liberty laid in Rhode Island have extended themselves over the whole United States—into which enlightened circle Massachusetts herself came after a delay of nearly two centuries—to call this evolution of civilization a "grotesque conglomeration" betrays a singular lack of insight into history. Such defects are not mere prejudices; they proceed from astigmatism of the mind.

Again, in respect of the large issues of history, Mr. Howe does not appear to have recognized that Connecticut was a better example of a Puritan Republic than Massachusetts. His collateral reference to Connecticut (p. 305) does not indicate that he was conscious of this patent fact. The true historical problem is more interesting than anything he develops or suggests. Massachusetts struggling in religious unrest, Connecticut steadily guided by theocratic control, Rhode Island in absolute religious freedom—all three commonwealths went in one direction; they went by democratic means to republican ends.

To a casual reader, the first portion or about nine chapters of the book would appear to treat of the social conditions and development of the colony at the Bay. Then the growth of town government is handled politically, and the clearly aristocratic functions of the towns are recognized and well worked out. Samuel Stone said wisely of the Congregational meeting, "it was a speaking Aristocracy in the face of a silent Democracy."

But this interpretation would not satisfy our author. He makes an arbitrary division after Chapter IX., assigning X.-XI. to a theocracy and XII.-XVII. to a republic. This arbitrary distinction is not made out. The Congregational ministers were file-leaders in their citizenship, whether, like Jonathan Mayhew in the Revolution, they stirred Massachusetts to its depths, or, like John Cotton in the persecution of Anne Hutchinson, they toppled on the surface. These were the men and the functions, name them theocratic or republican, as we may.

The best chapters are XII. and XIII., describing the autonomy and growth of the towns. Here the legal training of the writer tells in his work.

The book contains much interesting matter, generally presented in agreeable form, excepting the burdensome citations. It is not history; it is smart speaking to a thesis, imperfectly conceived and not deliberately thought out. It is significant that it closes with a flippant reference to Rev. Joseph Cook as a prophet (!!) to be recognized concerning the decadence of New England.

WILLIAM B. WEEDEN.

The Northwest under Three Flags, 1635-1796. By CHARLES MOORE. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1900. Pp. xxiv, 402.)

THE Northwest of a century ago offers to the historian a subject of engaging interest that is marked by all the classical unities—place, time, and action. While it is connected with Canada on the one hand, and with the thirteen colonies and states on the other, it still furnishes a distinct centre of unity in itself, and can be treated in a continuous narrative. We do not know why the year 1635 should be chosen for the beginning, for it was in 1634 that Nicolet pushed through the waters of Lake Huron and the Strait of Mackinaw and discovered Lake Michigan and the region beyond; but 1796, the date of the surrender of the Northwestern posts by Great Britain to the United States, and the passage of the whole Northwest under the third flag, is the proper place to halt, unless, indeed, the history is to be brought down to the present time. There are, to be sure, early rumors of a still earlier venture into the Northwest than Nicolet's, but they are uncertain, and in no sense mark the beginning of Northwestern history, and so may properly be dispatched incidentally, as has been done by the author of the present work.

Mr. Moore has seized the idea of the historical unity of the Northwest, and has aimed to produce a narrative account of it that shall be

marked by the same character. Moreover, he has well succeeded in his undertaking. His work shows careful study of sources, good sense in handling materials, and commendable skill in composition. He has a quick eye for the picturesque and romantic elements, in which his subject is so rich, and a facile pen in turning them to good account. His narrative is not indeed the narrative of Mr. Parkman, but it is orderly, clear, and in vigor and animation well sustained. It is also pleasant to find him not unfrequently correcting the errors of older and better-known writers and adding new facts to our knowledge. He also often shows an admirable grasp of the large relation of things, as witness the following on the connection of the Northwest with our early national history:

"In its defense Washington first learned the art of war; Franklin realized its possibilities and interested himself in its development; Patrick Henry planned with George Rogers Clark for its conquest; John Jay and Franklin and John Adams drew about it the lines of the United States; Thomas Jefferson bestowed upon it the inestimable boon of freedom; Washington's chief of engineers led its first settlers, and Mad Anthony Wayne subdued its savage inhabitants and received the surrender of its frontier posts."

But Mr. Moore does not always show as firm a grasp as this of the large features of his subject; he does not always make the reader vividly see and strongly feel the master forces that are working behind, or rather in, the events, and so fashioning important history. The defect is not compensated for by good descriptions of the French traders and boatmen or the interesting story of forest warfare. Sometimes there is no indication of the existence of important questions mooted among historians that have arisen out of the facts which the author relates. Occasionally, too, we notice errors in matter of detail. John Cabot did not discover America in 1498, but in 1497. There is no discussion of the policy that prompted the drawing in 1763 of the "King's Line," as it was called, between the heads of the rivers flowing to the eastward and to the westward from the flanks of the Appalachian mountains. We have a good account of the Pontiac war, and particularly of the siege of Detroit, as a series of events, but no plain statement of the ideas and plans of Pontiac. In dealing with the Quebec Act the author quotes the well-known indictment of the King on this score found in the Declaration of Independence, but we have no discussion of the policy of the act in relation to the Thirteen Colonies beyond these two sentences:

"Taken as one of the many reasons by which the ministers of George III. sought to curb and suppress the Colonies, the Quebec Act was unwise and impolitic. Viewed from the standpoint of a quiet administration of England's new territories, it was so successful that during the Revolution the Americans failed in all their efforts to detach the Canadians generally from their allegiance to the British."

Now, it is not wholly certain that the English ministers sought by the Quebec Act "to curb and suppress" the colonies, nor that it was owing to this act that the Americans failed "to detach the Canadians

generally" from their British allegiance. The most recent investigation of this subject was made three or four years ago by Professor Victor Coffin, who maintained "that the provisions of the Quebec Act were neither occasioned nor appreciably affected by conditions in the early colonies" and "that, far from being effectual in keeping the mass of Canadians loyal to the British connection, the measure had a strong influence in precisely the opposite direction."¹ We have no space to discuss the question involved, and shall not pass judgment upon it further than to remark that Professor Coffin's book is one with which the historian of the Northwest should feel that he is called upon to reckon. It is not even mentioned here.

Once more, the treatment of some events that occurred just before the first American settlements beyond the Ohio were made, is not altogether satisfactory. The author's statement of the proposition made by Jefferson in 1784 relative to the exclusion of slavery from the Western country would certainly mislead the reader, unless he is able to check it by an earlier knowledge. The bare reference to the Land Ordinance of May 20, 1785, gives the whole credit of the rectangular system of land-surveys to Mr. Jefferson, who brought in the bill, but it was New England insistence upon such a system and definite locations of land in the Western country that effected this great piece of legislation. Once more, the land-grant educational policy eventually adopted by Congress had its origin in the Land Ordinance, and not in the Ordinance of 1787, which simply contained an academical declaration on the subject.

It is very true that an author has a right to have his book judged with reference to the plan on which it is written, and that, judged by this criterion, *The Northwest under Three Flags* deserves high praise. The story, as a whole, has never been so well told before. At the same time, if Mr. Moore had somewhat enlarged his plan, so as to take a broader view of his subject, and to introduce some discussion of its more notable features, even at the expense of omitting some of the picturesque detail, he would have produced a more valuable book.

B. A. HINSDALE.

On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer; The Diary and Itinerary of Francisco Garcés, 1775-1776. By ELLIOTT COUES. (New York: Francis P. Harper. 1900. [American Explorer Series, III.]. Two vols., pp. xxx, 312.)

THIS book is a translation from the Spanish manuscript copy of the diary of Garcés, kept through his journeys in Sonora, Arizona and California. It has a valuable introduction by Coues and an abridged translation of the life of Garcés by Juan Domingo Arricivita.

The diary of Garcés is very meagre, chiefly because there was little to write concerning his somewhat aimless wanderings in the wilderness

¹ *The Province of Quebec and the Early American Revolution*, Madison, Wis. 1896, preface.

among savage tribes. Its great value consists in the fact that it is the earliest complete record of travels in the regions described. Kino, Ugarte and others had passed to the Colorado and the Gila, but Garcés was the first to leave an intelligible record of the country and its inhabitants. He also was the first to travel over the present routes of the Southern Pacific and the Santa Fe (Atlantic and Pacific) railroads across California, the former by way of Yuma and the latter by way of the Needles.

The knowledge to be gained by a careful reading of his diary alone is of comparatively little historical value, but with the excellent critical notes of Mr. Coues, aided by Mr. F. W. Hodges of the American Bureau of Ethnology, the book throws much light upon an obscure corner of United States territory. Moreover, because it is an original document of the first extensive exploration of a part of the present domain of the United States, it is an important addition to American history no matter how meagre the narrative. Garcés noted the various Indian tribes, their location and general characteristics, the rivers, springs, lakes, forests, deserts, mountains, and the ruins of Casa Grande, all of which add a certain interest to the narrative of his lonely travels. The charming presentation of the subject by the late erudite scholar has given new life to a somewhat tedious narrative. The critical notes on Tucson, San Xavier del Bac, Casa Grande, the rivers Gila and Colorado and many other points of interest dispel many errors of traditional belief.

Garcés was a Franciscan friar and missionary priest, stationed at the famous mission of San Xavier del Bac, not far from the present city of Tucson, in Arizona, then in Sonora. From this station he made five expeditions (*entradas*) to the north and west among the wild tribes, crossing rivers, deserts and mountains, through forests, facing dangers and enduring discomforts for the sake of the lives of others. The first journey was through the Papago country to the Gila river and return, a distance of about eighty leagues, made in 1768; the second *entrada*, in 1770, took him through the Seris and Apaches to the Gila; the third in 1771 was to the Gila and the Colorado; and the fourth was still more extended, as on this journey he crossed the Colorado and travelled over Southern California to the Mission San Gabriel, near Los Angeles. The fifth journey, of which a diary was kept,—the one translated in this book—came about in this way; Lieutenant-Colonel Anza was ordered by the viceroy of New Spain to ascertain if it was feasible to make connection over land between the missions of northern Sonora and those of the Pacific coast. Spain had conceived a wholesome fear of the encroachments on her territory on the north-west. A revival of life under Carlos III. had caused the planting of missions and presidios on the north-west coast and the viceroy was seeking the best means of extending and supporting the defenses of the border, hence the expedition of Anza. Anza was accompanied by Garcés and Diaz, two priests, an Indian guide and thirty additional men. After reaching San Gabriel mission, Anza sent Garcés back to the Colorado river, while he and Diaz pushed forward to Monterey. Anza returned to San Xavier and thence to Mexico

to report on his expedition. The report being favorable he was ordered to collect colonists and soldiers and go overland to establish a *presidio* and mission at the port of San Francisco. The priest Garcés accompanied the expedition as far as the Colorado river and from there he made journeys to San Gabriel by way of "the Tulares" and later journeys eastward to the various Indian tribes, going as far as Zuñi. It is the diary of this fifth expedition of Garcés, conducted largely on his own instance as missionary priest, that Mr. Coues has translated. A priest named Font went with Anza to San Francisco and kept a diary of the expedition, making a creditable map of the country, which is published in this book. Mr. Coues announced that the translation of the diary of Font would form the next number of the American Explorers series. Mr. Coues found three separate sources agreeing in general in the names and dates and general geography but much varied in some characteristics of general narrative.

The first (A) is *Diario del Padre Francisco Garcés* in the Library of the Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, No. 7415; (B) *Diario del P. Garcés*, belonging to Dr. Leon, but temporarily in the custody of Mr. F. W. Hodges; (C) *Diario y Derrotero que siguió el M. R. P. Fr. Francisco Garcés*, etc., from Vol. I. of *Documentos para la Historia de Mexico*. The last is the only printed copy until the present translation, which is confined strictly to manuscript "A," with notes from the other two.

While Anza's mission was in the interest of the Spanish government, Garcés and his priest companion were more directly interested in the salvation of the natives and the extension of the work of their religious order. One can scarcely realize the difficulties Garcés encountered in his journeys among the wild tribes, his only companion an Indian guide. Beyond the southern border of what is now Arizona there was not a white man in the entire region, over which roamed the savage Apache, a terror to whites and natives alike. Although it was about 233 years after the first Spaniards crossed the line of part of his travels, and nearly a century after the beginning of the work of Kino and Ugarte, there were no traces of Spanish exploration except a few traditional ideas, mostly religious, of the existence of the Spanish people. The journey was made at the time of the first and second years of the American Revolution. While the patriots on the Atlantic coast were gaining liberty and laying the foundation of a nation, Garcés was attempting to bring into subjugation a territory eventually to become part of the domain of the United States. It was a hazardous undertaking and conducted after the usual blundering methods of the Spanish régime, for Garcés was finally beaten to death by the people whom he sought to befriend. Nor was there much accomplished by the apparently aimless and misjudged expedition of Garcés. "But," says Coues, "it does not lessen our respect for the man, that he, like his Indians, was the victim of the most pernicious, most immoral, and most detestable system of iniquity the world has ever seen—the Spanish combination of *misionero* and

conquistador which had for its avowed and vaunted end the reduction of Indian tribes to the catechism of the church and the vassalage of the throne."

Spanish-American history is still in much obscurity and has much need of critical scholarship in every direction. The translation of original documents, with critical notes, seems the surest way out of the tangle. It is the only way by which the real history can be brought out of the mist of tradition, distortion and exaggeration. The translation of Garcés will do for Arizona what the work of Mr. Winship did for the Coronado Expedition. It makes one more permanent source in the history of the south-west, whose historical foundations are sure and available to all students. The book itself is an excellent piece of work, doing credit to both author and publisher.

FRANK W. BLACKMAR.

The Storming of Stony Point on the Hudson, Midnight, July 15, 1779; Its Importance in the Light of Unpublished Documents. By HENRY P. JOHNSTON, A.M., Professor of History, College of the City of New York. (New York: James T. White and Co. 1900. Pp. 231.)

In this work the capture of Stony Point, familiar to every American as an isolated exploit, is described as having an important strategic purpose and effect. Washington with his army was covering West Point from a further advance by the British, who had recently possessed themselves of both sides of King's Ferry, Stony Point and Verplank's Point, thus severing the shortest line of communication which the colonists had ventured to utilize between New England and the other colonies. To draw Washington out of his strong position, and commit him to a general engagement in the open, Sir Henry Clinton directed the ravaging of Connecticut, the execution of which has become known as Tryon's raid. It was to check this operation without playing into the enemy's hands that Washington conceived, planned, and ordered the attack on Stony Point. Its purpose as a counter-diversion was fully attained, as it caused the immediate recall of Tryon to New York. The author seems, however, to err in accounting for the abandonment of Stony Point three days after its capture by the following statement (p. 91): "Washington had no intention of holding Stony Point, as the enemy could besiege it by land and water, and on the 18th the place was evacuated." Documents cited in the appendix (pp. 165, 168, 171, 172) show that Washington had intended to capture and retain both Stony Point and Verplank's Point.

Tactically the attack on Stony Point owes its chief interest to its being a night operation. The precautions taken against a betrayal of the plan by officers or men, the information secured beforehand as to the vulnerable points of the enemy's position and the way of reaching them, the means of recognizing one another in the darkness, all the details that

interest a student of such an operation, are touched upon, if not specified. The author has made a diligent search for truth at first hand. About half the book is an appendix formed of letters, reports and other original documents, collected from various sources in Europe and the United States, a number of which have never been published before. The narrative is illustrated with a colored map of the Highlands showing the strategic positions of the opposing forces and Wayne's line of march to the rear of Stony Point; plans of Stony Point and Verplank's Point; photographic views of these and other places in the Highlands; and likenesses of Wayne and other prominent American officers. The map of the Highlands is compiled from surveys by Washington's geographer, the originals of which are in the possession of the New York Historical Society.

Yet with all this documentary evidence and the author's lucid narrative before him, the reader may find himself in want of light on certain points. The plan of campaign ascribed to Sir Henry Clinton is based, as the author candidly states (p. 43), upon a letter from Clinton dated September 9, more than three months after the opening of the campaign, or Clinton's capture of Stony Point; and nearly two months after its close, or his re-occupation of that point upon its capture and abandonment by the Americans. A perusal of Clinton's dispatches (pp. 31, 109, 121, 123, 141, 142) will leave a critical mind in doubt as to how much of the plan referred to was "hind-sight" and how much foresight.

There can be little doubt that, if warned ten minutes in advance, the British, as Washington said, could have repelled Wayne's assault. Only by providing in the most minute detail for every possible contingency, was success to be anticipated. In these preparations the military student will find the main lesson of the operation under consideration, a lesson which too many of our commanders in subsequent campaigns have shown themselves ignorant of or incapable of applying.

The author (p. 92) discredits the "story of the neighborhood that the British pickets were surprised and gagged by men in disguise . . . The tale," he says, "is hardly worth considering a poor tradition"; but he does not refer to Washington's instructions to Wayne (p. 155) for a vanguard to " . . . secure the sentries," nor to Wayne's order of battle (p. 159) for "an officer and twenty men a little in front, whose business will be to secure the sentries."

This monograph is a distinct and interesting contribution to the history of our Revolutionary War, and a useful work of reference for students of a subject in military science which seems to be gaining in importance, the night attack. The book is tastefully bound, printed in open moderate-sized type, and provided with an index.

JOHN BIGELOW, JR.

The Diplomatic Relations of the United States and Spanish America.

By JOHN H. LATANÉ, Ph.D., Professor of History in Randolph-Macon Women's College. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1900. Pp. 294.)

THIS work is based upon a course of lectures delivered by the author at Johns Hopkins University in January, 1899. The title would seem to promise a more comprehensive treatment of the subject than is contained in the six chapters which make up the book. The writer states, however, that no attempt has been made to cover the whole field of our diplomatic relations with Spanish America, and that the present volume is intended to serve as an introduction to the subject. An examination will also show that the negotiations discussed have been in the main with European countries regarding the affairs of Spanish America rather than with the Spanish Americans themselves.

The revolt of the Spanish colonies and the part played by the United States and England in founding the republics into which they were formed, are the subjects of the first two chapters. There is such lack of knowledge in this country regarding the other republics of the continent that so clear and concise a sketch of their origin as is here presented should be received with gratitude. The leading events of the war of independence, which resulted in the loss by Spain of all her colonies on the main land, are admirably compressed in a short space, and due justice is done to San Martin, Sucre and O'Higgins, for there is too general a disposition to regard Bolivar as the only remarkable man produced by the movement. None of these four great leaders of the revolution reaped the harvest of his labors. Bolivar died after witnessing the failure of all his plans. San Martin survived him almost twenty years an exile in Europe. Sucre was assassinated and O'Higgins retired from Chile, the scene of his exploits, to die in comparative obscurity in Peru. In the recognition of the independence of the republics, both the United States and Great Britain proceeded with the strictest regard for their obligations toward Spain. Although the insurrection broke out in 1810 and the issue of the conflict could be forecast as early as 1815, independence was not, despite the eloquence and influence of Clay, recognized by the United States until 1822, and by England until 1824. The formation of the Holy Alliance by Austria, France, Prussia and Russia, their intervention in Spain and their menacing attitude towards her revolting colonies, drew from President Monroe, at the suggestion of Canning, the celebrated declaration in his message of December 2, 1823, known as the Monroe Doctrine.

Chapter III. is devoted to "The Diplomacy of the United States in regard to Cuba." The attitude of this government towards the island until about the time of the Mexican war may be summed up in the words of Madison in 1810 "that the United States although they might be an inactive could not be a satisfied spectator at its falling under any European Government." After the Mexican war, the policy of the United

States took a more positive turn as was shown, not only by the decided stand against European intervention in the affairs of the island, but also by efforts to acquire it by purchase. This tendency to the acquisition of Cuba reached its height during the somewhat stormy mission to Spain of Pierre Soulé of Louisiana, who, being a Frenchman by birth, might with advantage have taken note of Talleyrand's maxim regarding the danger of "trop de zèle" in diplomacy. The remarkable proclamation of Soulé, Mason and Buchanan known as the Ostend Manifesto went so far as to announce in hysteric terms that the United States would be justified "by every law, human and divine, in wresting the island from Spain," should that government be indisposed to accept the \$120,000,000 suggested by these gentlemen as the maximum price. The Civil War brought to an end the agitation for the purchase of Cuba, which was mainly in the interest of the South and entangled with the slavery question. Since the war, the only Cuban problem, but a serious one, thrust upon the attention of the government has been the attitude to be adopted during the insurrections in the island, and the complications, such as the *Virginus* affair, resulting therefrom. The problem has been finally solved. The ultimate destiny of the island is dismissed by the writer as too problematical to fall within the scope of this volume.

In discussing the proposed Central American Canal, to which a chapter is devoted, Professor Latané reviews the negotiations with Nicaragua regarding a canal through that country, the conclusion of the treaty of 1848 with New Granada by which the United States guaranteed the neutrality of the Isthmus of Panama, and gives as much attention as his space will allow to the history of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty—an attention which it well merits in view of the confusion existing in the minds of many honorable persons regarding the binding force of that treaty. Of the style and method of the negotiations conducted by Messrs. Blaine and Frelinghuysen in order to secure the abrogation of the treaty, anything but a high opinion is expressed. Mr. Blaine in his celebrated circular of July, 1881, to the American representatives abroad, outlining the policy of American control of an inter-oceanic canal, completely and inexplicably ignored the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and exposed himself to a summary reply from Lord Granville simply calling attention to its existence. Professor Latané justly maintains that the neutralization of the canal is the only proper method of effectively providing for its safety. Before the case of the Suez Canal should be cited as a precedent, as is done by the author, it would be well to have a somewhat clearer conception of just what the present attitude of the English government is towards the Constantinople Convention of 1883, providing for the neutralization of the canal, in view of the reservation regarding that convention made some years ago by Mr. Curzon in the House of Commons, when parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

The two remaining chapters of the work treat respectively of "French Intervention in Mexico" and the "Present Status of the Monroe Doctrine." In the former, the agreement between England, France and

Spain for intervention in Mexico for the purpose of securing a settlement of their claims, the determination of Napoleon III. to establish an empire in Mexico which caused the retirement of the other powers, the policy of the United States and the negotiations which resulted in the withdrawal of the French forces and the collapse of the government of Maximilian are told of in an interesting way. The greater part of the chapter on the Monroe Doctrine is taken up with a sketch of the Venezuelan question. In a summary of "the policy of the United States in reference to arbitration of American questions" the statement is made that "in disputes between American States it (the United States) insists that they be settled without calling in the aid of European powers." If this means, as it seems to mean, that it is the policy of this government not to allow a European power to arbitrate in a dispute between two American states, it would certainly be an extraordinary and arbitrary development of the Monroe Doctrine. No such view has been taken by the United States. For example, one of the most important questions which has arisen between two South American republics since the war between Chile and Peru, has been the frontier question between Chile and the Argentine Republic. Several times within the last fifteen years these two states have been on the verge of war. In 1897 a treaty was negotiated submitting the matter to Queen Victoria for arbitration. The arbitration was accepted and the question is now awaiting decision.

McLoughlin and Old Oregon: A Chronicle. By EVA EMERY DYE.
(Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Co. 1900. Pp. viii, 382).

AMONG the latest writers in the prolific field of the Northwest is Mrs. Eva Emery Dye, who has presented us a chronicle of old Oregon, with Dr. John McLoughlin as the central figure. There could hardly be a more interesting combination, and Mrs. Dye has brought out the salient features, to the point of being spectacular. The impression left upon the general reader is very similar to that received from a drama. But the student of history, however the action in the play may entertain him, regrets the mingling of fiction with historical truth in a work which is likely to be mistaken for a wholly serious one. Mrs. Dye refrains from referring to her authorities, although she uses with great freedom all those who are well known, and many of which no account is given. This method leaves her free to put her characters on the stage in any picturesque dress or attitude which she may choose. Where this irresponsibility deals only with the purely romantic it is in a degree pardonable, since it enhances the attractiveness of the book. But when, either by assertion or by implication, it leads the reader to believe that which is essentially erroneous it becomes mischievous.

Mrs. Dye holds a facile pen, which is directed by a lively imagination, qualities which the public writer must possess, and which the present reckless period in literature to a large degree demands. There is a great deal of romantic truth in Oregon history, the simple verity of which

renders it charming, or wonderful. The proverbial "short step from the sublime to the ridiculous" is what threatens the writer who undertakes to improve upon the original.

All who have known and have written about Dr. McLoughlin, especially all American writers, agree that he possessed a splendid physique and a grand manner—that he was in the highest degree dignified. Mrs. Dye herself probably means to convey an impression of his majestic personality, but in this she fails. In some passages he is made to roar with rage, in others to be able only to say "tut, tut, tut," while in others still he is "gay and brusque." Such quotations as are given of his social sayings are the weakest possible. To this portraiture his descendants and surviving friends strongly object. Probably no man quite touches his own ideal, or the ideal image of him created by loving admirers. Dr. McLoughlin came as near to doing that as it is given tried humanity to do, and the worst that can now be said of him is that he was "too good" to the undeserving.

It is impossible to refer to the many instances in which the author of *Old Oregon* distorts her picture of those days. Choosing here and there, we will say of page 170 that the missionaries here referred to were a party of Presbyterian recruits who joined Mr. W. H. Gray on his return from the States in 1838, and whom Mr. Ermatinger of the Hudson Bay Company was kindly escorting from Green River Rendezvous to the Columbia, by the usual Indian trail travelled by the Company. It was a wide, plain and smooth trail, made so by constant use and the custom of the Indians in hauling their heavy property, and sometimes their children, on drags made of poles attached to the saddles of their pack-horses. This made a good road except in those rocky passes of the Blue Mountains through which the trail ran. There was no "jungle" on the route, and no "forest," except on the Blue Mountains, where the growth could not have been heavy, since forty men of the immigration of 1843 in five days cleared a wagon-road over the range. Neither were there any "snow-drifts" on the range in the month of August, when the party crossed. Therefore Mr. Ermatinger was not "slyly taking the missionaries through the most difficult goat-trails over the mountains," to convince them that a wagon-road was impossible. Even the necessity of introducing the element of villany into melodrama does not excuse the perversion of history. Rivalry there was between British subjects and Americans in Old Oregon, but criminality, even inhospitality, never.

On page 235 Dr. Whitman is made to say that his wagon went to Oregon, or at the least this is implied; but on page 155 it is admitted that the first wagon to reach the Columbia was that of Joseph L. Meek, in 1840. On page 217 Sir George Simpson, at that time governor of the Hudson's Bay territory in America, is said to have left Fort Vancouver late in 1841 on his journey around the world, *via* Siberia, as he did, but on page 234 Daniel Webster, in Washington, is quoting Sir George as saying to him (so it must be understood), that wagons can never get over the Rocky Mountains; that he has "traversed those wilds from his

youth," etc.; whereas all the travelling ever done in Oregon, or west of the Rocky Mountains, by Sir George, was when he was on his journey from Montreal to Vancouver to inspect the forts on the northwest coast, and especially to settle some troubles at Sitka, whence he departed for Siberia, and reached London in due time *via* Petersburg, Russia; never in his lifetime, so far as discovered, having been in Washington, or having discussed international questions with American statesmen. Sir George was simply a fur-trader.

There are many more unjustifiable instances of this struggling after dramatic effect in serious matters in Mrs. Dye's book. In unimportant matters, such as representing Eloise McLoughlin as an equestrienne, we must say "wrong again." At Vancouver the rules of the Company forbade the participation of women in any social functions, and Mrs. McLoughlin and her daughter were forced to live in almost conventual seclusion. With her nimble pen our author ought to improve upon this performance.

FRANCES FULLER VICTOR.

The History of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. By IRA DUDLEY TRAVIS, Ph.D. [Publications of the Michigan Political Science Association.] (Ann Arbor. 1900. Pp. ix, 312.)

MR. TRAVIS has produced a valuable monograph on a subject which has been little discussed in its historical aspects. Begun as a doctor's dissertation but afterwards enlarged, it embodies the results of extensive and careful research and of candid deliberation, and presents a comprehensive review of the various questions of which it treats. The first chapter is devoted to an examination of the British claims to territorial dominion in Central America. This is followed by a review of the conditions that existed at the time of the conclusion of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. The negotiations are next described; and we are then led up to the controversies that arose, soon after the conclusion of the treaty, as to its construction and enforcement. The methods of settlement proposed form the topic of yet another chapter, concluding with the arrangement effected in 1860, to the expressed satisfaction of the United States. The history of the treaty since 1860 is then exhibited; and the volume ends with a chapter in which the author's conclusions are set forth. He maintains, on the whole, that the British claims to dominion in Central America were not in their origin legally justified; that by 1850, however, it had become necessary, in order to secure by peaceable means the freedom of the canal from British domination, to enter into a conventional agreement for that purpose; that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty embodied the best arrangement that could be made under the circumstances; that the controversies that ensued were so settled as to give substantial effect to the purposes then entertained by the United States with reference to the canal, and to the views which it had maintained as to the proper construction of the treaty; that the demand which subsequently arose for an

exclusively American control represented a later conception of policy ; but that the enduring interests of the United States and of the world at large may be best preserved by an open and neutral transit, which it was the great design of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty to assure.

In his discussion of the development of American policy with reference to Central America, the author, in our opinion, hardly does justice to the administration of President Polk. He states (p. 44) that when the Nicaraguan Secretary of State, in November 1848, sent to Washington an account of the British aggressions then taking place, Mr. Buchanan "did not even take the trouble to reply to it"; and that when the Supreme Director of Nicaragua sent "a direct and pathetic entreaty to President Polk," he was "no more fortunate than his Secretary of State had been in securing the assistance of the United States." These expressions scarcely represent the real situation, which is disclosed by the author himself further on (p. 58), where he shows that the administration had already sent Mr. Hise, as chargé d'affaires, to Central America with instructions which really laid the foundation of our later policy in that region. Mr. Hise was instructed not only to negotiate treaties with the Central American states, but also to use his influence to induce them to form a union, with a view to resist foreign aggression. He was also charged fully to investigate the British encroachments on the Mosquito Shore, and with this direction there was coupled the distinct intimation that the United States would not acquiesce in them. The administration was anything but uninterested and negligent in regard to the interoceanic route through Central America ; and only three years previously it had made the treaty with New Granada in relation to the Isthmus of Panama.

The least felicitous chapter in the volume is that entitled "Contemporary Conditions," namely, the conditions under which the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was negotiated. These are set forth very fully, but with a frequency of repetition that underestimates the reader's memory for words as well as for matter. It is stated, for example, in immediate succession, that the slavery agitation in the United States had become so heated that "it gave color to nearly all our political discussions" and exercised an influence on our "foreign policy" (p. 86); that the feeling was so intense that "talk of disunion was freely indulged in by the more radical elements of both parties," the "danger of disunion and civil war" being "so imminent" that there was a general acquiescence in the Compromise of 1850 (p. 87); and that the domestic affairs of the country were "in a most critical state," the "agitation of the slavery question" having "taken on a sectional character and become so bitter as to threaten the dissolution of the Union" (p. 87). Other examples might readily be produced. Sometimes they seem to be due to restating the same matter on the authority of different writers ; and occasionally there creeps in an inconsistency. For example, it is stated on page 61 that the Hise treaty with Nicaragua, which was signed after Taylor became President, "might have led to serious consequences had it not been for the conservative tendencies of the administration in power when the treaty

was concluded"; that "the change of administration" was, however, "the signal for a more vigorous development of the policy lately adopted by the United States regarding Central America"; and in a foot-note, on the authority of Mr. Schouler, that the reason why the Hise treaty was not favorably considered was that "the Taylor administration, to a certain extent, represented the reaction against the aggressive foreign policy of its predecessors."

The printer's work cannot be praised. There are many errors in it. Examples: p. 1, "pretentions"; p. 9, confusion in references to the foot-notes; p. 11, "expell"; p. 13, in the headline, "Rbitish Claims"; p. 14, "tranquility"; p. 16, "form" for "from"; p. 18, "Mosquito"; p. 23, "amunition," "detachment"; p. 27, "that" for "than"; p. 33, "intolerance"; p. 91, "vigilence"; p. 212, and elsewhere, "Columbia" for "Colombia"; p. 236, "estopp"; p. 177, the last line is found at the foot of p. 178. These are by no means all the errors that we have noticed, but it is needless to multiply instances.

P. 75 speaks of "the conclusion of Cushing's treaty in 1845" with China. The treaty was concluded in 1844. The ratifications were exchanged in 1845.

J. B. MOORE.

The Life of William H. Seward. By FREDERIC BANCROFT. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1900. Two vols., pp. vi, 554.)

MR. WEBSTER'S three requisites for true eloquence apply to good biography as well—the man, the subject, and the occasion. The subject of this biography was worthy of the best study and commemoration; its occasion was fortunate, notwithstanding the excellent sketch of its subject which we already had in Mr. Lothrop's contribution to the American Statesmen Series, and the two very complete and exhaustive volumes of F. W. Seward, for a broader sketch than the former and a less detailed and bulky work than the latter seemed to be demanded; the man—the biographer—had previously worked on historical lines, had excellent facilities for writing this biography, and was moved in his task, as we may judge, by the spirit of industry and the purpose to produce not only an authentic, but a just and adequate portrait. Such concurrence of favoring conditions is not often surpassed.

For fully thirty years, and even longer—1838 to 1869—William H. Seward was an original force in our political life. For the first half of this period, he was the distinctive leader of a movement more critical and vital than any other in our history since 1789; and for the latter half he was in official stations which gave him large influence and control in public affairs. He was, moreover, undoubtedly a man of first-class ability, of sleepless industry, of wide-ranging activity, and of ardent ambition. No other of the many who might, with more or less propriety, be named leaders in the same movement, can be reckoned Seward's equal or rival in the art and practice of political or party leadership. Great qualities,

qualities as essential to success as Seward's, appeared in others. Chase was possibly more philosophical, Sumner more learned or widely-read; many others were more eloquent in speech; but Seward was the one leader who by nature and training was best fitted to gather and weld together into an effective organization the deep and determined forces which from 1840 to 1860 gradually brought on the crisis and struggle of civil war. Jealousies of contemporaries, passions heated in the fierce blaze of war, the spirit of "Thorough" pervading so many sincere minds at the end of the armed struggle, the current notion that Seward like Clay was only a politician too shifty and ambitious to be trusted, these and other like influences have combined since Seward's death, as they did in his lifetime, to deprive him of no small part of what we deliberately regard as his just share of honor and fame as a leader in the most dramatic period of our annals. In our judgment, the highest success of such a work as Mr. Bancroft's was probably intended to be and certainly ought to have been, lay in dispersing the mists of detraction and misconstruction which had latterly gathered about Seward's character and career, and presenting him—the man and the public figure—in true proportions and in clear light—

"both in time,

Form of the thing, each word made true and good."

Some intimations, if not authorized statements, reached the public in advance of its publication, that the present work was, so to say, written from the inside, with access to and use of documents or sources of authentic information not open to previous writers and students. Such forecasts do not seem to have been warranted. So far as the reviewer has discovered or been informed, Mr. Bancroft has here dealt with no new documents and has presented no new facts. Under these conditions what may be required of him is a true picture, a just estimate, a readable narrative, and an effective setting of the whole in the framework of circumstances, events and times in which Seward lived and worked. Above all else, we think, his part as well as duty lay in giving the world a carefully presented and well avouched estimate of Seward's mould of character, his moral or ethical standards, his fidelity, or want of it, to principle. That he was a politician is certain; as this, was he merely crafty and self-seeking, or rather, able and sagacious? He was clearly a statesman, responsible and experienced; as this, was he capricious and visionary, or consistent and patriotic? In a word, was he only an opportunist, or was he a firm, principled statesman and political leader? It was not required of the author to set down categorical answers to these inquiries; but it was the part of a new study of Seward, holding a half-way place between a sketch and a detailed life, to put before us clearly and fairly—more clearly than had been done before—the materials of a safe and just judgment.

Seward's work and career covered two separable periods of time and were concerned with two separable lines of effort, both the periods and

lines overlapping and interlacing, but still separately visible. For ten years—1838 to 1848—his most important service was his leadership of the Whig party in New York and in the nation, a service prolonged for the Republican party until 1860. Here, if anywhere, we shall see the character of his political party service.

On these points, Mr. Bancroft's chapters V., VI., VII., while giving nothing new in substance, furnish ample materials. Here we may as well say that the first half of the author's first volume is much the most thorough part of his work. Despite a persistent, and to us unaccountable, tendency to find unworthy or purely selfish purposes in what Seward did in party politics, to read into what he wrote or said sinister meanings or designs, Seward emerges from the author's ordeal, if not unharmed, at least with cleaner hands than any ruling politician of to-day whom we could name. His intimacy with Thurlow Weed, from which we verily believe has come most of the *odium politicum* which has fallen upon Seward's head, does not appear in these volumes to deserve great reprehension, though it is visited with constant criticism from Mr. Bancroft and elsewhere. Weed was simply an old-time, managing, editorial wire-puller—no very dangerous or monstrous character in any view, especially in view of bosses of to-day who shall be nameless here.

Into the larger field into which he stepped through his entrance to the United States Senate, in 1849, Seward carried substantially the party methods he had used in New York. We here record our strong impression, founded upon what these volumes disclose, saving Mr. Bancroft's personal opinions or comments, as well as upon a brief personal contact with Seward, and a much longer and closer acquaintance with Weed, that Seward's political and party work from 1849 to 1860 was relatively clean and patriotic; by which we distinctly mean that in methods and aims he was the equal of any of his contemporaries, and far superior to the ruling party leaders of any party in our country to-day.

Mr. Bancroft's two volumes are equally divided between the two halves of Seward's career—his party leadership, and his service in official positions of national importance. The first volume closes with the conclusion of the political presidential campaign of 1860, the second volume opening with the critical winter of 1860-1861, that unfortunate and dangerous interregnum in our political system, but far more critical and dangerous in 1861 than ever before or since. Every reader of these volumes will see, as every reviewer has seen, the change of tone on Mr. Bancroft's part at this point. Hitherto he has magnified—it is not too much to say it—what he regards as Seward's faults, but with the fateful winter of 1860-1861 the tone changes, or seems to change, and Seward's rule of conduct and policy is now finely stated: "the highest statesmanship consists in getting the best results from actual conditions" (II. 7). No apparent effort is thenceforward made to find ulterior or unworthy motives, and though it would not be fair to say that Mr. Bancroft anywhere becomes Seward's excessive eulogist, we are no longer fretted by querulous or obtrusive criticism. Seward's bad foresight at this crisis

can, of course, be easily shown; and it has been shown to superfluity; but it must at least be clear now, as to many it was not then, that it was absolutely necessary to avoid an outbreak during that sad, we had almost said shameful, interregnum, to tide over the interval between the meeting of Congress in December, 1860, and the advent to his place of the new president. Seward's temper was genuinely hopeful, optimistic. It enabled or helped him to "speak smooth things" or even to "prophesy false visions" without conscious moral obliquity, and, indeed, with a purely patriotic and honest mind. The end does not sanctify the means, as an abstract proposition, but in this case the end was the highest and the means were not bad. There is no evidence of Seward's insincerity here. He saw with calm vision while others were helpless and hopeless; and he doubtless believed his most sanguine vaticinations. If it is needful to mark his fallibility of judgment here, it is not just, nor warranted by historical proof, to doubt his good faith; and surely not to question the value of his strenuous and unfailing hope. Macaulay makes one-half of the "true philosophical temperament" to consist in "much hope," and the other half in "little faith." Seward by this standard was at least half a philosopher, and if so, whether he was a whole one or not does not seem important. We lay emphasis upon this passage in his career because so many, not, however, including Mr. Bancroft, have made it the text of ridicule and depreciation.

Our knowledge of Mr. Bancroft's previous studies and pursuits had led us to expect not only a thorough treatment, but a fresh, substantial addition to our appreciation of Seward's diplomatic services. What he gives us is not without merit, in form and substance, but truth compels the verdict that it does not add to what has already been known and passed upon.

Seward's qualifications for Secretary of State, so far as previous study and interest went, were far superior in 1861, to those of any other American then living. Chapter XXX. of the second volume is valuable as a general brief view of the diplomatic situation in 1861; and it is immediately followed by four chapters covering the chief incidents of our relations with France and England during the war. These chapters, if not brilliantly or graphically done, are a good specimen of orderly and clear presentation. Here must be noted, however, one omission very difficult to account for,—the notorious M'Crackin letter and the affront which resulted in the summary retirement of Mr. Motley from Vienna,—an incident of which all the world took note, and which in the receding light of more than thirty years ago still brings a hot flush to the brow of all who loved and honored the most brilliant historical writer and the most accomplished gentleman of his generation. We are familiar with the apologies offered by thick-and-thin eulogists and personal friends of Seward. They are in vain. The act at best was done without a word of objection or protest from Seward. It goes farther than any act we know of to give credit to the bitter charge of his enemies that the old Secretary clung to his office under President Johnson at the ex-

pense of his self-respect and personal integrity. We hope Mr. Bancroft will sometime tell why a quite full life of Seward makes no allusion to this affair, though Mr. Motley's appointment is here credited to the Secretary of State (II. 153, 154).

One of the best chapters in style and substance is that on Political Prisoners (II. 254-280), a passage of our war history as indefensible as it was ineffective, an instance of Seward's excessive activity, as well as attended by more than one ugly *contretemps*, e. g., the case of Ex-President Pierce, and by many quite unnecessary acts of futile injustice. Mr. Bancroft's views here are worthy of note and commendation. The system was as unwarranted in law and even good policy as were the legal tender acts in which Chase acquiesced.

These volumes present, as any sketch of a career so long, varied, active, and conspicuous must, numerous points of interest which cannot be touched here. The author offers a final or general estimate of Seward, in most of which we concur. He had previously written of his course in the Cabinet of Lincoln in the early months of the war, as we think with entire justice, that "his ambition was for the Union vastly more than for himself" (II. 149). His summation (II. 526-529) somewhat to our surprise, opens thus: "The excellence and success of Seward's career were mainly due to his *superior ideals*"—the italics ours—"and his skill in practical politics." His alleged "insincerity and egotism" are set down to his "irresistible impulse to pose and explain and appear all-wise and all-important," a characteristic which was not observed, we think, in his lifetime, but may have existed. This is followed by the unqualified dictum that "he holds the first place among all our Secretaries of State" (II. 528) whereat other and perhaps wiser judges will demur, recalling the names of at least a half-dozen previous secretaries. Here, we are reminded of Lowell's sarcasm—given by Mr. Bancroft in a note (II. 504)—"more than any minister with whose official correspondence we are acquainted, he carried the principle of paper currency into diplomacy."¹

But except in some details, we agree with the final estimate of Mr. Bancroft; and we can pay him the tribute of our hearty admiration of the labor and ability which his work shows.

History, and still more, biography, is written to little purpose if it does not lead to judgments and conclusions. A reviewer may have his; and ours of Seward is carefully formed from some personal observation of the man and much more study of his career, together with a somewhat extended acquaintance with several of his most intimate and life-long associates and friends in public and private life. Judged by just standards, he appears to us a high, bright figure in the large group of those who bore foremost civil parts in the anti-slavery struggle and the ensuing war; a man of pure life and magnanimous spirit; patriotic to the core: unselfish to a degree greatly beyond any other party leader who ranked beside him; governed by a strong sense of duty; ready to stand alone

¹*Political Essays*, 293.

for what he regarded as good policy or good morals; gifted with great fitness for party leadership and exercising his leadership for noble ends; a statesman in the highest sense of the word, who sought his country's honor and welfare, and largely helped to save her in the dire agony of her long struggle with slavery and what slavery caused. The shadows—foibles, weaknesses, or whatever else—on such a life and character might be much deeper than critics of Seward have ever claimed, without greatly darkening its beauty and fame.

Mr. Bancroft's handsome volumes are adorned by two fine portraits of Seward—one, we suppose, taken at the age of about 40, the other dating about 1860. The latter is familiar to all. We never look upon it without recalling Macaulay's reference to Lord Eliot's portrait of John Hampden—"the intellectual forehead, the mild penetration of the eye, and the inflexible resolution expressed by the lines of the mouth."

We cannot possibly admire Mr. Bancroft's literary style; but we can, in conclusion, award him the high praise of not making his work what a few months ago in the pages of this REVIEW¹ he commended in another biographer—"a zealous and successful defence and eulogy" of the subject of his biography.

DANIEL H. CHAMBERLAIN.

Charles Sumner. By MOORFIELD STOREY. [American Statesmen Series.] (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1900. Pp. iv, 466.)

MR. STOREY'S *Life of Sumner* is both a thoughtful and a sympathetic narrative of the statesman's career. Its general characterization of his mental and moral traits is accurate, pointing out his deficiencies as well as his excellencies, his faults as well as his virtues. Whilst giving Sumner full credit for his sincere and powerful advocacy of the radical principles of the anti-slavery reform, he does not conceal the fact that the orator was less successful in commanding the assent of his associates in public life than in carrying along with him the applause of the constituency which he represented. The very confidence in assertion of a high standard of right and in the deduction of present duty from it, which gives power to the platform orator, grew, in his case, into an apparent assumption of infallibility which sometimes offended his equals in the Senate. The practical duties of legislation made them impatient of arguments which often ignored the limitations which are met in applying sweeping maxims to the every-day affairs of life. The tone of the uncompromising prophet who warns and denounces, who declares the right with an assurance of certainty, chafes and irritates when debatable ground is reached. An *ipse dixit* is then a challenge and a provocation. The eloquence which had been inspiring whilst all were on common ground becomes wearisome when the common purpose has been attained, and men are urged in the name of consistency and of fundamental right to adopt measures which they instinctively feel are perilous.

¹ IV. 745.

This was more or less the case when, at the close of the Civil War, the Union had been made safe and slavery had been abolished. The problems of reconstruction were complicated in the extreme, but Sumner advocated his own solution of them as if eternal right was as clearly demonstrable as the day. His two leading dogmas were that secession had been state suicide, leaving blank paper on which the majority in Congress could write what constitutions they would, and that dominance in the South by means of negro suffrage was the necessary means of maintaining emancipation. On these points Mr. Storey's natural sympathy with the subject of his biography makes him come something short of the historical treatment which the lapse of time now makes possible. It cannot fairly be said that judicious students of history and of legal principles commonly approve either of Mr. Sumner's dogmas. A state has made an insurrection and has failed in maintaining it. No doubt it may be punished for it. War indemnities may be demanded in varying form and extent. But the very demand of these implies that the corporate state survives which is to pay them and undergo the penalty. The conqueror may destroy the state, but whether that be right or wrong, politic or impolitic, such a fate cannot be imposed upon the body already *felo de se*. You must have a live subject for an execution. And as to the extent of penalties, whilst the rights of conquerors in war are indefinite they are not boundless. Mr. Sumner himself recognized this when discussing retaliation. "What civilization forbids cannot be done . . . You cannot be barbarous and cruel." The relations of belligerents are subject to the principles of international law as far as these are applicable, and the destruction of the corporate existence of a state has almost never been approved in the final judgment of history. In practice, too, the consent of the conquered state has usually been found a desirable safeguard for continuing submission to the terms imposed, and the organization which waged the war will give a more binding consent than any new one made for the purpose.

As to negro-suffrage as a necessary condition of peace based on ultimate human rights, there were inconsistencies in Mr. Sumner's position which were very open to criticism. He advocated statutory action by Congress rather than amendment of the federal Constitution. Yet a majority of Senators and Representatives came from states which themselves denied suffrage to negroes. For them to enact it was to lose even the pretence of basing the change on right, and make it the imposition of mere penalty on the vanquished. Sumner did not seem to feel this embarrassment, but others did. The fifteenth amendment of the Constitution proved a more acceptable method of reaching the result, as saving self-respect and consistency in the North. The popular sentiment was in this more delicate than Mr. Sumner's. He failed to feel other inconsistencies. His scheme excluded an educational qualification among the freed men, though he recognized the general desirability of such a test. Thaddeus Stevens put the reason crudely in saying that it was necessary to secure the dominance of his party in the country at large. Mr. Sum-

ner was more smooth in expression but with unquestionably the same meaning. Can we regard it statesmanship to ignore the certainty of failure in governments based on the exclusion of the class of the intelligent, the property-owners, the accustomed leaders of society, of public opinion, of trade, of commerce and of manufactures? Are sociological and psychological principles considered when to such a perilous experiment is added the transfer of power from one race to another, and from the master to the recent slave? Mr. Sumner excluded "Indians not taxed" from the voting class in his scheme of reconstruction, and found no repugnance, in their case, to discriminating on account of race and color, or to refusing to apply to them the principle of basing government on the consent of the governed.

We could wish that in these and in some other respects Mr. Storey could have got his own consent to a more radical discussion of the principles and doctrines involved in the Sumner-Stevens plan of reconstruction. A careful study of the results and of the reasons for its failure is needful to help us to judge of its original wisdom and conformity with great principles of human nature and of right. In saying that Sumner's attitude in the great debate "secured the *establishment* of equal suffrage without regard to color," the author might almost be suspected of irony, in view of the history of five-and-thirty years. If Sumner was really unflinching in his adherence to the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Independence, the unity of truth is such that its harmony should be capable of proof. A new book upon his life, at this day, would seem a proper place for the analysis of the evidence of this consistency, and Mr. Storey's interesting book would have gained philosophical value by its thorough treatment.

The Downfall of Spain : Naval History of the Spanish-American War. By H. W. WILSON. (Boston : Little, Brown and Co. 1900. Pp. xvi, 452.)

MR. WILSON is well known as the author of *Ironclads in Action*. His clear perception and straight forward style of writing make his books always interesting and instructive. We are in the beginning interested in his view of the *Maine* destruction, and eager to discover how this event was looked upon by one who, like Mr. Wilson, feels it his duty to give every chance to the American side of the question, though himself not specially favorable to our navy. He condemns, on page 23, the Spanish stories of American lack of discipline as fabrication, and comments favorably upon the behavior of the crew after the explosion, but takes occasion to say that "American ideas of discipline are not altogether our ideas." Later on page 36 the author mentions the fact that experts in England, among them Admiral Colomb, thought our navy and the Spanish navy somewhat on an equal footing, and that neither country was strong enough to attack the other. On page 37 the author gives as his opinion that "the Americans showed no exceptional forbearance after the de-

struction of the *Maine*," although most observers of our country at that period commented upon the restraint the country put upon itself, and the dignified and deliberate action of our government with reference to it. It thus appearing that the author has certainly no bias in favor of the Americans, we may look upon his ultimate statement concerning the *Maine* as devoid of prejudice. This statement is as follows: "still it does seem to the author to have established the probability that the *Maine* was destroyed by a mine."

Referring to the strength of the two fleets the author has given a very clear statement of the tonnage, guns, and armor of our navy and that of Spain. It is, however, in comparing the spirit and training of the personnel of the two fleets, American and Spanish, that he shows the clear discernment which has been his chief merit as a critical writer. The second chapter of this work, especially the latter portion of the chapter, which treats of questions of morale and discipline, is well worth reading for its clear and forcible presentation of facts relative to crews and officers of both navies. In discussing "the plan of operations in the West," which is the title of Chapter III., the author makes natural deductions from the reports that were to be obtained. His judgment of the Spanish plans, or lack of them, is very clear and goes to the bottom of the situation. There is something pathetic in his comments on page 98 upon Cervera, his valor above reproach, his chivalry and tenderness of heart, winning for him the admiration even of his enemies. His assertion, however, that Cervera was by nature despondent and a pessimist, and that he in character and temperament resembled Villeneuve, is open to question, as being unjust to Cervera. Villeneuve commanded great fleets out of which much might have been made by an admiral of resolution, in the long period during which he commanded them. But it is doubtful whether any commander, even if he possessed proper energy, could have done anything in the time given to Cervera, with such a force as was at his disposal. To judge Cervera correctly, we should have to know what he knew of the spirit of his subordinates. Sound strategy and daring tactics are useless if the fighting spirit does not permeate the fleet or army concerned, and it does not appear that the Spaniards under Cervera's command, though brave seamen and gallant officers, had that fighting spirit. Those who served against them in Santiago and Porto Rico were, I think, united in this opinion. No love of war for war's sake was observable, no vigor of initiative, on the contrary a profound apathy, a brave but melancholy acquiescence in the decrees of an unkind fate. No more gallant gentlemen, however, are found in the world than the group of officers whose parole the writer took on the quarter-deck of the *Indiana* as his prisoners on the afternoon of the great battle; nor could one have wished to see a more dignified and noble attitude than that of Admiral Cervera at the close of the battle, when first a prisoner in our hands. The writer believes that if Cervera could have been certain of his ships and their equipment, could have felt that his officers and men were yearning after desperate and sanguinary battle, he himself would

have been among the most eager of admirals to join close action with us, even though the odds were against him. This estimate of the man is based upon his bearing and conversation when first brought a prisoner to our ships, while the smoke of battle still hung upon the water.

What he actually did, was or seemed to him the best possible with his poorly equipped vessels. He felt it his duty to avoid battle if possible. In so doing he made one false step, choosing to take his squadron to Santiago rather than to Cienfuegos. It is probable that the cause of his so doing, was that Cienfuegos was nearer to the strength of our fleet than was Santiago, and that he did not reflect that Cienfuegos as a refuge would be supported, if necessary, by the whole strength of the Spanish army in the west of Cuba, while at Santiago he would be practically isolated from all hope of assistance. This mistake in judgment was his only one, but it was very serious in its results. It has been said that his small coal supply made the choice of Santiago necessary, but this is not regarded probable by those best acquainted with the situation.

The author next considers the American plans of operations. In judging of these, it should be remembered that a naval plan, as well as an army plan, must have some reference and relation to the plan of the sister service, and it is probable that Admiral Sampson's first proposal to attack Havana, of which the author speaks, had in view the landing of an army force shortly afterward, to hold the positions and gather the fruits of any success that the navy might have in any attack. It soon became apparent, however, that the army would not be ready to land in any force, not for days and weeks only, but for months. As to the chances of success at Havana, there seems to the writer but little doubt that an attack, made as Admiral Sampson proposed to make it, and beginning the day after war was declared, would have resulted favorably. The western batteries could have been taken in detail, and, with them destroyed or silenced, the city itself would have been at the mercy of the guns of the fleet. What did actually happen was that, in pursuance of this prohibition of the Department, a blockade was undertaken of Havana and adjacent ports, and a waiting policy was inaugurated.

The author has the correct idea of the bombardment of San Juan de Puerto Rico : that it was a reconnaissance necessary in order to make certain that Cervera was not in the harbor, and that Sampson showed wisdom in hauling off as soon as it was discovered that he was not there.

In describing the movement of Shafter's army from Tampa to Daiquiri, the author has departed from his usual rule of depending upon official reports, and has been led astray by newspaper comments. The convoy was not in more straggling order than was contemplated in the plans ; a rear guard was provided for, which it was expected would gather those vessels together which fell behind. This was all foreseen, and the urgency of the Navy Department's despatches to Captain Taylor as to pushing ahead in order to relieve our marines at Guantánamo, made it most unwise for him to delay the rest of the convoy after he had made all arrangements for guarding the slower ships left behind. As it was,

the rear guard arrived and joined Captain Taylor's main body within two hours after his reporting the convoy's arrival to Admiral Sampson. The remarkable success attending this transporting of a great force of 50 ships and 17,000 men without loss or detriment, is the best proof that there was no improper straggling, no disobedience on the part of the transports, no unforeseen confusion or lack of water.

Whether Shafter should have chosen Daiquiri to land ; whether he should have come at all to Santiago ; are questions of tactics and strategy as to which men differ. It is held by some that consistent strategy would have been to block the harbor-mouth with the *Merrimac*, watch it with a few ships, and then direct Shafter's army as well as the main force of the fleet to other fields of action, such as Havana, Cienfuegos or Porto Rico, and that the strategic alternative of that plan would have been to hold the strength of the fleet at the entrance and bring the army there, but to leave the entrance unblocked, and see to it that it remained open and clear.

However the strategy may be, the proper tactics appear clear and well defined. The army should have held to the coast line, occupied the ridge at Aguadores, moved thence along the ridge upon the Morro, and from that vantage-point, with the aid of the fleet, captured the Socapa and Punta Gorda batteries, when the fleet would have quickly destroyed the mines, entered the harbor and engaged the ships lying there. The movement of the army into the interior, far from the support of the fleet, is regarded by most military students as false tactics.

The book is too full of the details of the campaign to permit all of its good points to be noted in the short space allowed this review. Mr. Wilson touches lightly but clearly upon the *Merrimac* incident, upon the responsibility for our delay in blockading Cervera in Santiago, and is at his best in his discussion of Cervera's correspondence with Blanco, upon which his clear deductions throw a light which dispels much of the doubt which has hung about their relations.

Of the battle of Santiago the author should be allowed to speak without criticism, and no one can read unmoved his lucid description and sometimes dramatic recital of the events of that great day.

H. C. TAYLOR.

The Philadelphia Negro : A Social Study. By W. E. BURGHARDT DU BOIS, Ph.D. [Publications of the University of Pennsylvania, Series in Political Economy and Public Law, No. 14.] (Boston : Ginn and Company. 1899. Pp. xv, 520.)

DR. DU BOIS is a negro who was graduated from Fisk and Harvard Universities, studied in Germany, was for a time assistant in sociology in the University of Pennsylvania, and is professor of economics and history in Atlanta University. His history of the *Suppression of the African Slave Trade* was the first volume of the Harvard Historical Studies. He was engaged by the University of Pennsylvania for the special purpose of

making this study of the negroes of Philadelphia, and he gave fifteen months of hard labor in getting the material for it. In Philadelphia are to be found, he says, some forty-five thousand persons of African descent, who very noticeably do not form an integral part of the community, and he set out to learn something of their geographical distribution, of their occupations, homes, organizations and especially of their relations to their million white fellow-citizens. The purpose was "to lay before the public such a body of information as may be a safe guide for all efforts toward the solution of the many negro problems of a great American city." The method of making this study was a house-to-house visitation, by Dr. Du Bois himself, of the negro families in the ward of the city where a fifth of the colored population is. A half-dozen schedules were used for noting information, but the visitor, received cordially in all but a dozen homes, did not confine himself to categorical questions, and a discussion followed, as to the condition in general of the negroes. The average time spent in each house was about twenty minutes. This careful inquiry was followed by a general survey of the conditions in other wards to note differences and correct conclusions. We should add that Dr. Du Bois spent two months, also, in studying his people in a plantation region of the South, and has availed himself of many sources of information. The result of this inquiry is given in eighteen chapters, three short ones dealing with its scope and meaning, and all the rest with the history and present condition of the negroes of Philadelphia—as individuals, as an organized social group; of their physical and social environment; what education they have and how they earn their living; their organizations; their relation to the pauperism and crime of the community; their use of the suffrage; and the contact between the white and the black races.

This book is not merely a census-like volume of many tables and diagrams of the colored people of Philadelphia. The author seeks to interpret the meaning of statistics in the light of social movements and of characteristics of the times, as, for instance, the growth of the city by foreign immigration, the development of modern industries, and the influx of children of freedmen from the South. He is perfectly frank, laying all necessary stress on the weaknesses of his people, such as their looseness of living, their lack of thrift, their ignorance of the laws of health, the disproportionate number of paupers and criminals among them as compared with the whites. He shows a remarkable spirit of fairness. If any conclusions are faulty, the fault lies in the overweight given to some of his beliefs and hopes.

Brief references only can be made to several of the important general conclusions given. Dr. Du Bois believes that the most pressing question of the day for negroes is that of employment; not mere increased educational opportunities nor a higher standard of home life, but the opening to negroes of the usual employments of a community, so as to allow the mass of them some choice in a life work, to afford proper escape from menial employment to the talented few. He feels that the

possibilities of a people should be judged not by the average of them but by the best of them. "As it is true that a nation must to some extent be measured by its slums, it is also true that it can only be understood and finally judged by its upper class." In the upper class of the city negroes Dr. Du Bois finds much encouragement. He acknowledges that they should do more for the less fortunate of their race, but reminds us that "the uncertain economic status even of this picked class makes it difficult for them to spare much time and energy in social reform." The crucial point to him of the present position of the person with only a little African blood, in the "City of Brotherly Love"—the stronghold in the past of abolition and of the Republican party to-day—is the impossibility of rising out of the status or group of the negroes. Irish and Germans may rise from the group of immigrants, but the colored men of ability cannot rise beyond a certain place, while the influx of ignorant and cheap colored laborers lowers the standards of wages and of living, pauperism and crime are increased, and the leaders of the race are dissatisfied and discouraged. For the shiftless and the bad there are charities and institutions, "but for the educated and industrious young colored man who wants work and not platitudes, wages and not alms, just rewards and not sermons,—for such colored men Philadelphia apparently has no use." We understand the warmth of these words when we read the examples given of young colored persons able to perform the duties, but unable on account of color to secure the positions of clerks, typewriters, etc. This state of things is due chiefly, in Dr. Du Bois's judgment, to a color prejudice, and this he believes can be done away with in time, just as the class prejudices of earlier centuries in Europe are being wiped out gradually. The negro problems are not more hopelessly complex than many others have been; and he looks for a wider and deeper idea of our common humanity. To it, the blacks and the whites have each much to contribute.

Such a study as this should be made in many cities and country districts for comparisons. And more than this we need, what Dr. Du Bois does not give, more knowledge of the effects of the mixing of blood of very different races, and of the possibilities of absorption of inferior into superior groups of mankind. He speaks of the "natural repugnance to close intermingling with unfortunate ex-slaves," but we believe that the separation is due to differences of race more than of status.

In the appendix is a carefully made and instructive study of negro domestic service in the seventh ward of Philadelphia (the same ward in which Dr. Du Bois made his house-to-house visitation) by Miss Isabel Eaton. Colored wage-earners are chiefly domestics. Miss Eaton lived for nine months, while making this study, in the Philadelphia College Settlement in this ward.

The Clarendon Press has published Part XXVI. of the *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe*. It contains, first, an ingenious, if somewhat complicated, map of England and Wales in 1086, by Mr. James Tait, who

has endeavored to show the boundaries of England at the time of the Domesday survey, its administrative sub-divisions, the situation of the fiefs of some of the chief Norman magnates, the growth of castle-building, the towns, the classes into which they appear to fall, and the chief ecclesiastical foundations in existence in the year named. There is an inset map showing Welsh conditions in 1185. Secondly, Miss Lina Eckenstein gives a map of Italy for the period 1000-1067, with two insets, one showing the general outlines for the century and a half preceding, the other showing Sicily under Saracen rule. Third, there is a sheet showing the Ottoman Empire in Europe from 1356 to 1897, by Mr. W. Miller. The letter-press is clear and well devised, as usual; Mr. Tait's is unusually elaborate.

Outlines of the History of Religion, by John K. Ingram, LL.D. (London, Adam and Charles Black, 1900, pp. 162.) The character and scope of this little volume are not very clearly indicated by the title. Instead of containing in outline a history of the various religions of the world, as the title would lead one to infer, it offers to the reader a somewhat abbreviated statement of the views concerning the history and philosophy of religion which Auguste Comte developed in Vol. III. of his *Politique Positive*. The author, who is an earnest and reverent disciple of Comte, disavows any claim to originality in the present work, and is content to present in clear and simple form what he esteems to be the important but too little known teaching of the founder of positivism. The writer's own contribution is confined to the footnotes and concluding remarks.

After a brief discussion of the nature of religion and its constituent elements, Fetishism, Polytheism, The Catholico-Feudal Transition and The Modern Movement form the leading divisions of the work. Fetishism is employed in the most vague and general sense of the term, in which it is practically synonymous with animism. Monotheism is not treated as distinct from polytheism but is regarded as a "reduction and concentration of polytheism." The Catholico-Feudal Transition is discussed in its relations to the Greek and Roman systems. As the Greek civilization had developed the intellect and the Roman the active powers, there remained, it is said, the cultivation of the affections as the task of the third transition. Catholicism with its grave theoretical difficulties is viewed as owing its power largely to its social efficiency. Protestantism is regarded as at best a makeshift, affording only a "semi-satisfaction" to the intellect while inferior to Catholicism in the cultivation of the religious sentiments. It can thus only serve to mediate the coming of the "religion of humanity." Positivism regards all forms of religion as not only necessary but also beneficent; they serve as a school-master to bring mankind to the "final religion."

The entire discussion bristles with questionable historical generalizations, which, in a brief notice, can receive no attention. The constructive portions are open to all the difficulties of the positivistic programme,

while, throughout, the tendency is to ascribe too great an influence to religion alone, apart from the other factors of civilization.

This little book, in which the author has sunk his own personality in that of his master, has yet a personal interest, and even pathos, of its own. While the familiar appeal to the practical fruits of a given religious belief cannot straightway be accepted as a final test of its validity, it is interesting to learn from personal testimony the influence upon conduct of a view of the world and of human life which so violently contradicts all orthodox creeds. These elements are best rendered in Dr. Ingram's own words: "Intellectually constrained to accept the philosophic basis on which the Positive Religion rests, I have tried its efficacy on my own heart and life; and, whilst lamenting the insufficient degree in which I have followed its teachings, I have learned to appreciate its practical power. No creed seems to me so effectually to destroy the 'refuges of lies' by which our partiality for ourselves leads us to excuse our misdeeds and shortcomings. I have found it to pronounce the demands of duty in such a way that they cannot be mistaken or eluded. And it appears to me to be alone capable of real social efficacy; in particular, no otherwise than through its extension can the moral unity of mankind be ultimately realized Holding the religion I profess to be the *unum necessarium* for society, I cannot be content to pass away, as I must soon do, without giving public expression to that conviction."

WALTER GOODNOW EVERETT.

A History of the Jewish People during the Maccabean and Roman periods, including New Testament Times, by James Stevenson Riggs, D.D. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900, pp. xxi, 320.) This volume forms part of the "Historical Series for Bible Students" under the editorship of Professors Kent and Sanders. Its title explains clearly enough its position in the series and the field covered by it. While the history of the Jewish nation, during these stirring centuries, is recounted for its own sake, the relations of the period to the Old and New Testament history are constantly kept before the reader's mind. The book is, as the author says, "a contribution toward the interpretation of the Gospels in so far as a knowledge of the faiths [?], conditions, and aims of Judaism can be interpretative of the form and method of the activity of Jesus."

In a manual of the popular character contemplated in the plan of this series one does not expect to find new contributions to the subject. These would indeed detract from its usefulness. Professor Riggs has done well to limit himself to setting forth in his own way the best results of recent work in this field. Solidity and sobriety characterize his discussion. His judgment is sound and his conclusions on disputed points always within the evidence. If any criticism may be made in respect to his facts, it is that the author has not always grasped with accuracy and put clearly the elements and situations of the larger politics of which Judaism was a part. But here he has only followed in the footsteps of his predecessors.

In general, then, the author's plan is admirable and his matter trustworthy. His literary presentation is more unequal. The habit of inserting quotations from other modern writers into the body of the text, indulged in somewhat excessively by Professor Riggs, while it testifies to the modesty of the author, weakens confidence in his independence of thinking and breaks the unity of the presentation. He seems to have warmed to his work but slowly. The story of the beginnings of the Maccabean struggle is almost tame. The treatment of Herod's reign is stronger, in matter and manner as good as anything written on the subject. In the episode of Jerusalem's last days the author rises to something like stirring description. The passage is the climax of the book.

A series of appendices containing genealogical tables and critical and archaeological material adds to the value of the work. There are furnished also an excellent historical chart, three good maps, references and full indexes.

A History of Spain from the Earliest Times to the Death of Ferdinand the Catholic, by Ulick Ralph Burke, M.A. Second edition, edited, with additional notes and an introduction, by Martin A. S. Hume. (Longmans, 1900, two vols., pp. xxxi, 416, viii, 383.) In 1895 Mr. Burke, after "four happy years of varied research," published his history of medieval Spain. The author's untimely death having prevented a revision of the work at his hands, this task has been undertaken by Major Hume, the well-known editor of the *Calendars* of Spanish State Papers. The changes in the new edition consist of a slight rearrangement of the order of the chapters, the correction of obvious errors of statement in the text, and the addition of a number of brief footnotes "where the information seemed to need qualification, explanation or supplement." The editor has also added a preface in which he develops the view that, owing to geographical and ethnological considerations and the comparative slowness of national development in Spain, its history, "better than that of any other European country, enables the philosophical historian to trace the concatenation of causes and effects in the life of a nation," and thus demonstrate the scientific basis of his teaching. In the republication a more attractive external form has also been chosen. These alterations were all desirable, and as Mr. Burke's volumes must serve for the present as the best presentation of the subject in English, any improvement in them should be welcomed. At the same time it must be pointed out that the most serious defects of the original work are still untouched. The narrative is as uneven and scrappy as ever, it gives the same impression of half-assimilated learning, it still lacks unity and flow. There is the same reliance on writers like Sismondi and Fleury and Montalembert, the same insular regard for what Englishmen may have said on the subject, the same neglect of important modern monographs, and, what is more remarkable, of the two most considerable recent works on the general history of the period—the *Geschichte von Spanien* of Schäfer and Schirrmacher and the *Historia General de España* issued by the Royal Academy of History.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

Side Lights on English History, being Extracts from Letters, Papers and Diaries of the past three Centuries. Collected and arranged by Ernest F. Henderson, Ph.D. (New York, Holt, pp. xxii, 300.) Students and teachers of history have long been indebted to Dr. Henderson for his *Select Historical Documents*. They will, therefore, turn with interest to this new source-book, an attractive and imposing volume, illustrative of modern English history from Elizabeth to Victoria.

Dr. Henderson has laid under contribution State Papers, Somers Tracts, Historical Manuscripts Commission's Reports, *Historische Zeitschrift*, news-letters, memoirs, etc., etc., and has succeeded in getting together a large amount of very interesting matter. The character and career of the different sovereigns from Elizabeth to George the Third are illuminated by extracts from contemporary writers, and the history of such events as the execution of Mary Queen of Scots, the coming of the Armada, the Gunpowder Plot, the trial of Charles I., the plague and fire of London, Monmouth's rebellion, the American War of Independence, the death of Nelson, and the battle of Waterloo is told in the language of the time.

As to the use which the student may make of this material the editor says, "I should suggest that he be given a topic corresponding to the heading of one of my thirty-two groups and be asked to make an abstract of the salient points from his text-book. After he has done this, and added some supplementary reading, I should consider him to have reached a frame of mind most suitable for approaching the sources." That is, text-books and histories are to come first in the reading of history, and independent study of the sources later. The wisdom of this advice becomes apparent when we examine the character of some of the sources drawn upon, the scurrilous "Character of James I." by Sir Anthony Weldon and "Bloody Assizes" by John Dunton, the Puritan accounts of Arthur Wilson and Sir Simonds d'Ewes, the Tory memoirs of Reresby and of North, and the Whig narrative of Burnet. These are, of course, among the most interesting contemporary narratives, and the editor has chosen from them the most interesting pages, but they are far from reliable.

These source-books are not histories and he who reads them is not studying history; but if one has time to use them, and if it is pointed out that half of the matter in them is trivial and the other half unreliable because partisan, they may doubtless be used with profit. They will at least add interest—though perhaps a fictitious interest—to the study of history. This is true of the book under review, but with this further qualification: the book seems too large for the use of young students, the contents too familiar to be of much value to advanced students. The *Court and Times of James I.*, Whitelocke, and Pepys, which are most quoted, are accessible to all students of English history,—where they are not accessible the study of English history must be out of the question. These criticisms of the book seem to me inevitable, but after all, interest is the main thing in a book of this kind, and in this respect the editor

has been eminently successful ; the book is interesting, every page of it, and everyone must say so. And the illustrations are an added element of interest.

W. DAWSON JOHNSTON.

Dr. Osmund Airy's new edition of Burnet's *History of My Own Time* is carried on by the issue of the second volume (Clarendon Press, pp. 533) to the end of the reign of Charles II. The announcement made elsewhere that Dr. Airy has entered into official engagements which will make it impossible for him to continue his work, must be a matter of great regret to all historical students who are interested in the Revolution of 1688. To what was said in this journal (III. 166) on the publication of the first volume there is little to add on the present occasion. The plan is the same, and the editor has carried it out with the same minute fidelity, good judgment and extensive learning as before. An excellent index to the two volumes is provided. It is stated in the preface that the editor intended to place in an appendix the full text of Burnet's "Characters" from the Harleian MSS., "which appear in an inaccurate and incomplete form in Ranke's sixth volume" ; but that he relinquished the design, the Delegates of the Clarendon Press having decided to incorporate these "Characters" with other material in a supplementary volume.

The History of the Castle, Town, and Port of Dover by the Rev. S. P. H. Statham, rector of the Castle church (Longmans, pp. 462), has some of the faults and some of the excellencies of the average local history. He refers to Gardiner's *Students' History*, as if it were an authority upon Roman Britain, and he gives a good deal of desultory information which were fitter for a text-book of English history ; but the topographer, it may be said, cannot go far astray in the use of authorities, and even the introduction of some general history may be excused.

Dover has two chapters of history which are peculiarly her own : the history of the Tower of Julius Caesar so-called, the most ancient building in England, and the history of the Church of St. Mary-in-the-Castle, the oldest church in Britain. But the castle records being lost, the materials for the history of tower and church are very inadequate, and the author, while siding with Canon Puckle in assigning an early date to the church, can only say that it was *probably* erected in the first century. About the history of the town there is less conjecture, the town accounts existing from the year 1365 and the minutes of the Common Assemblies from 1506. The author dates the town walls from the reign of Edward II., though Burrows traced them back to Norman times and Puckle to earlier times still. These points will interest the specialist.

But who does not know the charm of topography as mere reading ? In this, for example, one can learn that the tariff for passage across the straits was 6d. for a footman and 2s. for a horseman, and how every householder was compelled in the time of the third Edward to have a tub full of water outside his door every night in case of fire, and of the

great cannon in the Castle, Queen Elizabeth's pocket pistol they called it, cast in 1544 and capable, it was said, of carrying a twelve-pound ball for seven miles, and many things besides, entertaining if nothing more. The book should be welcome to all lovers of olden time.

From Capetown to Ladysmith: an Unfinished Record of the South African War. By G. W. Steevens, edited by Vernon Blackburn. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1900, pp. 198.) The series of letters from South Africa which Mr. Steevens was writing for the London *Daily Mail* was abruptly closed by his death last January. The fragment of correspondence has been made into a book, with a supplementary chapter containing a sketch of Mr. Steevens's life and an estimate of his character and abilities by Mr. Blackburn. Mr. Blackburn's part is an ill-digested piece of composition. The letters themselves possess a twofold interest: they are another specimen of the work of a young journalist of great promise; they give some unusually vivid impressions of the scenes in South Africa at the outbreak of the war. Mr. Steevens enters into no discussion of the causes of the conflict or the rights of either side: he tells simply what he sees and hears on the way from Capetown to Ladysmith, with a detour, so to speak, for the battle of Elands-laagte. The book inevitably suffers because the editor was not free to select and connect the letters as Mr. Steevens himself might have done; nevertheless it offers a number of brilliant descriptions and bits of narrative. The account of the charge at Elands-laagte, for example (pp. 62), is as rapid in movement as the charge itself. Stevenson and Kipling have taught us how writing of this sort should be done; and Mr. Steevens was an apt pupil.

Paris as Seen and Described by Famous Writers. Edited and translated by Esther Singleton. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1900, pp. xiv, 397.) This collection of articles and illustrations may probably be ranked with the books which the International Exposition has called out. The publishers state that its purpose is to supplement the guide-book, and its editor has followed the usual plan of guide-books and narratives of travel. The text is arranged under three heads corresponding with the three larger divisions of Paris—the Cité, Left Bank and Right Bank—and the order under each head is topographical, proceeding quite regularly from east to west; so that any one who prefers literary description to mere statement of facts would find here an excellent substitute for his Baedeker or Joanne.

English and French writers are quite equally represented in the various chapters, though the French excel in importance and length. Victor Hugo and Louis Blanc both contribute sketches of the older town, while Thackeray, Balzac, George Sand, Sophia Beale, Arsène Houssaye, Hare, Charles Dickens, Jr., Zola, Théodore de Banville and Fournier are included among those authors who treat of the modern city. Under their guidance we visit churches, palaces, museums, mingle with the crowds

which throng the streets, squares and gardens, and take part in the daily life of the Parisians. Good photographs of the buildings or places described embellish the text, and maps affording bird's-eye views of the different quarters of Paris serve as a glossary.

Historical accuracy is not to be expected in a compilation of this nature, nor should we cavil at such fusions of fact and fancy as Hugo, for instance, delights in. And the objection which might be raised that many of the descriptions are a generation and more old can be met by the answer that the illustrations are recent and correct possible misconceptions.

But the errors of proof-reading are more serious. French accents come and go at will, as "Theatre des Varietés" (p. 308). Words are disfigured, as *Tuit* for *Fait* (p. 251); Quai de la Rappe, for Rapée (p. 222). The editor seems to have personal views about orthography, for "Sevigné" and "Palais Royale" occur repeatedly; while to label the vista of the Champs Élysées the "Bois de Boulogne" (p. 390) shows negligence. These defects detract from the general excellence of the press-work.

F. M. WARREN.

A Short History of Russia, by Mary Platt Parmele (New York, Scribner, pp. xii, 251). Mrs. Parmele reminds one of a person wading along an irregular beach. At times she makes rapid progress, and is not impeded by the depth of water; occasionally she meets with a gully where expert swimming is required, and expert swimming is not in her province. The book seems to be largely a condensation of Rambaud's *History of Russia*, but the author is not slavish in following Monsieur Rambaud's lead. She has some just ideas of the formation of the Russian Empire and she is quite right in dealing with it as the history of a power and not of a people. Unfortunately she does not write in a very accurate English style and the volume is disfigured by many misprints and by some serious errors of statement. For instance, speaking of the Princes of Moscow, she says (p. 63) that their line has remained unbroken until the present time. But a little further on (p. 97) speaking of the death of Dmitri and Feodor, the sons of Ivan the Terrible, she says, "There was not one of the old Moscovite line to succeed to the throne," and she adds "The work of the Moscovites was finished, and the extinction of the line was the next necessary event in the path of progress." Such inconsistencies of statement are inexcusable in a history. She speaks of the fanatical sect known as Raskolniks. Raskolnik is simply the generic term for dissenter; there are and have been in Russia many different sects of Raskolniks. She declares that the title Tsar is derived from the name "Caesar." One would be rash to say that it was not derived from Caesar; nevertheless it is a question whether the word Caesar may not be derived from Tsar. A little revision would make the volume a useful, brief compendium of Russian history and the vivacity of the narration is certainly in its favor.

Indianer und Anglo-Amerikaner: Ein geschichtlicher Ueberblick, von Georg Friederici, Oberleutnant im Infanterie-Regiment Graf Bose (1. Thür.) Nr. 31. (Braunschweig, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1900, pp. 147). The author of this brochure is a German infantry officer who, from long residence and extended travel in the United States, has come to be interested in the Indian question as determined by past and present governmental policy. A previous work dealt with the practice of scalping, especially as fostered and encouraged in the colonial wars. The present one discusses the relations between the two races from the first discovery down to this year of grace 1900, following the lines of Helen Hunt Jackson's *Century of Dishonor*, with a narrative of slave-hunts, scalping-raids, massacres and broken faith that is an old story to readers of Indian history. The author deals primarily with the United States, beginning with the Spanish period, and follows in turn the history of the Delawares, the Iroquois, the Cherokee, the Sioux, Apaches, Cheyennes, Poncas, Nez Percés, the Texas tribes and those of California. Some of the facts given are comparatively well known, such as those relating to the massacre of the Christian Delawares in 1782 and the removal of the Cherokee in 1838, but others noted are compiled from sources not readily accessible. To those who have looked upon scalping as a custom practised only by Indians, or by the rude borderers of a past century, it may be a surprise to learn that the hostility of the Apaches to the Americans dates from a massacre of a part of that tribe committed in 1836 by a band of professional American scalp-hunters in the pay of the governor of Sonora. In more recent times scalp-bounties were offered, and probably paid, by the legislature of a western territory. In 1862 the governor of Arizona ordered that every Apache man should be killed, every woman and child sold into slavery. In California the natives were practically exterminated by the miners in regular Indian hunts. The belief of the Columbia River tribes that the missionary Whitman had deliberately uncorked the smallpox among them does not appear so foolish when we know that as far back as 1764 Sir Jeffrey Amherst, the British commander-in-chief, undertook to destroy the Indians adhering to Pontiac's alliance by sending among them infected blankets.

The author draws a sharp contrast between conditions in Canada, where Indian outbreaks are nearly unknown, and in the United States, where our Indian wars have cost us five hundred million dollars, and ascribes much of the difference to the shifting policies of our partisan politics. The numerous references show that the author is thoroughly familiar with the literature of the subject, and while some of the criticisms are perhaps unnecessarily severe, the work is a distinct contribution to American history.

JAMES MOONEY.

The Growth of Nationality in the United States, by John Bascom. (New York, Putnam's Sons, 1899, pp. 209.) The essays along the ancient and honorable lines of constitutional history in this work are no

better and no worse than they have been written many times heretofore. Their condensed form is a good feature. But in a chapter on "Strife between Classes" as well as in his few pages of "Conclusions," the author has said something new and said it tersely and clearly on what may be called the sociological aspects of constitutional development. He feels that the growing nationality of the United States has surmounted three obstacles: provincial life, sectional strife between the states, and the decentralization of the federal departments. A fourth obstacle, reaching the proportions of a positive present danger, he finds in the contests between the classes and the masses, each of which seeks to use the power of the state against the other. The especial forms which this conflict takes are examined in contracts, corporations, police power, liquor laws, railroads and the interstate commerce commission, injunctions, labor movements, and the income tax.

In treating these politico-sociological questions, the author is likely to become alarming to timid people and a happy find for sensational journalists. At times he sounds like the voice of Jefferson and again like a Populistic stump-speaker. Few will be found to deny the presence of the most obnoxious class legislation, and legislation in behalf of special interests, in the work of all our legislative bodies, or to deny that combinations of capital exist which are restrictive of individual motion. Few will question the severity of the author's arraignment of these evils. But the very fact that he calls recent political conditions in England an evidence of advance and those in America an evidence of retrogression is proof that in due time we too shall find a quietus for this conflict, certainly an inherited sin, and rendered doubly hard by local conditions. The author has done a service in collecting and calling attention to these dangers; if he live long enough he can afford to laugh at them.

From the standpoint of the historical student, there would seem to be no justification for the publication of *The Territorial Acquisitions of the United States*, by Edward Bicknell (Boston, Small, Maynard and Company, pp. xi, 110). It is simply the briefest sort of statement of facts relating to the various territorial acquisitions of the United States, from the first acquisition of the Northwest by the central government under the Articles of Confederation to the annexation of Hawaii in 1898. It contains nothing new, and little, if anything, that is not perfectly familiar to everyone who possesses more than a superficial knowledge of American history.

The book is evidently neither for the specialist nor for the student, but rather for the general reader, who is unacquainted with the history of our territorial expansion, and who, in view of our present conditions, desires to find in as brief compass as possible the main facts of our history bearing upon these conditions. To such an one this little book may prove useful. Although relatively too much space is devoted to the annexation of Texas and the Mexican cession, and some assertions and rather sweeping generalizations would be bettered by further explanation,

the book as a whole is a sufficiently accurate and impartial statement of how the United States has acquired its vast territorial possessions. The much discussed question of the constitutional right to acquire territory, whether remote or contiguous, is accepted as settled, and consequently the only question with regard to our recent expansion is one of propriety or wisdom, a question upon which the author expresses no opinion, but leaves each reader to decide for himself.

In the appendix will be found interesting tabular statements of the size and population of all of our territorial acquisitions, and a comparison of the area of the United States and of these acquisitions, and of the population of the United States with certain European countries.

Our Presidents and How We Make Them. By A. K. McClure, LL.D. (Harper, pp. xi, 418.) Colonel McClure's reputation as a journalist intimately acquainted with the leaders and events of many recent presidential campaigns would naturally cause large numbers of readers to turn eagerly to a volume of his reminiscences, and he is abundantly justified in publishing them. But instead of contenting himself with meeting this desire, which he could do exceedingly well, he has chosen to mingle his recollections with a general history of presidential canvasses, which he is quite incompetent to write. This was a serious error of judgment, but nothing more. What is truly shocking, however, is the fact that, in the first 153 pages, (the wholly unnecessary portion devoted to the period preceding the campaign of 1860), nearly every significant statement is derived—"convey, the wise it call"—from Mr. Edward Stanwood's *History of Presidential Elections*. It is needless to resort to the "deadly parallel column"; suffice it to say that page after page of Colonel McClure's book gives evidence of bodily transfer of matter. It is true that he says at the end of his preface: "I am indebted to Edward Stanwood's *History of Presidential Elections* and to Greeley's *Political Text-Book of 1860* for valuable data of the earlier conflicts for the Presidency." But it is also true that he frequently claims to have made independent investigations and exhaustive researches for material. The phrase of the preface is all too mild for the obvious facts; and it is not till p. 395 that, in a sort of appendix, he admits that the scores of electoral tables which appear on the preceding pages have been "adopted" from Stanwood. Nor has he, apparently, usually done the latter the justice of using the revised edition of his book, that which bears the title *History of the Presidency*.

The personal reminiscences, which practically begin with 1860, are often very interesting, and sometimes valuable, if one allows for an exaggerated estimate of the importance of Pennsylvania in crises of national politics. Col. McClure was very near the inner circle in several campaigns. For an experienced and famous journalist, he writes badly. There are not a few sentences as bad as this (p. 54): "The hero-worship of Jackson was earnest and always aggressive when summoned to battle, but Clay was beloved and idolized beyond that accorded to any leader of any party in the history of the Republic."

The History of Malden, Massachusetts, 1633-1785, by Deloraine Pendre Corey. (Malden, the author, 1899, pp. xviii, 870.) This volume is the result of nearly half a century's research and study; and the author's intelligence, diligence and acumen are discovered in every chapter. In addition to the subjects usually treated in a town history, are the English Maldon; a study of the formation of the town government and of the duties of all the several officers; the Marmaduke Matthews troubles and their important bearing on the ecclesiastical history of Massachusetts; Joseph Hills and his pre-eminence in the preparation and codification of the Colony Laws of 1648-1649, which is demonstrated, and the claims advanced by prominent writers on behalf of Capt. Edward Johnson disproved; the Rev. Michael Wigglesworth—a more complete treatment of his life and work than even Dean's admirable *Life*; the French Neutrals; lists of Malden men in Philip's War; the French War, and the Revolution, with their respective service; and a chapter on Malden in the Navy which contains much new matter and assigns to Capt. Daniel Waters his proper place in the naval history of the Revolution.

The famous instructions of May 27, 1776, to the town's representative, instructing him to support any declaration of independence which the Continental Congress might make, are here first printed as they appear upon the town records.

The old, wide-spread, and persistently held hypothesis that Joseph Hills married Rose Dunster is, we hope, here finally exploded by giving the register of his marriage to Rose Clarke, of Burstead Magna, Billericay, Essex.

Mr. Corey's dependence on original authorities, his full citations and copious notes will satisfy scholars, who will also commend his thoroughness of treatment and his purpose to portray our forefathers as they were—with all their faults and limitations.

The volume, printed at the University Press, is illustrated and well indexed. It is entitled to high rank in the department of local history because of its valuable contribution to knowledge and of the admirable manner of its arrangement and execution.

HENRY H. EDES.

Constitutional History of South Carolina from 1725 to 1775. By D. D. Wallace, A.M. Presented at Vanderbilt University for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. (Abbeville, S. C., 1899, pp. xi, 93.) Starting out with the thesis that the growing power of the Commons House of Assembly is the most noteworthy feature of colonial history, Dr. Wallace devotes a few chapters to the framework of the government and then proceeds to discuss the controversy between the governor and council on one side and the assembly on the other. Special stress is laid on the disputes over money bills, as it was by gaining control over the purse that the assembly secured a position of supremacy in the government.

Though the manuscript journals and public records at Columbia have been carefully used, a few minor errors have crept into the book, as, for

example, the statement that the election law of 1759 was the regulation until the Revolution (p. 11), and the inference that the common pleas and general sessions formed only one court (p. 21). The principal criticism to be made, however, is that the work is entirely too brief for a period of such length and of so much constitutional importance. The years before 1765 are disposed of in a few pages. The Stamp Act, the circuit court acts of 1768 and 1769, and the dispute in regard to the appropriation for the Wilkes fund are, however, considered more in detail.

W. ROY SMITH.

Old Trails on the Niagara Frontier, by Frank H. Severance. (Buffalo, N. Y., 1899, pp. xii, 321.) The nine essays of this book illustrate early periods in the history of the region lying between Lakes Erie and Ontario. The volume is addressed rather to the general public than to the historical student and the essays are too brief to serve for much more than an index to point the enquirer to broader fields. The "Niagara Country" has not yet received the attention it deserves from historians and Mr. Severance has done well in calling attention to the fact. Fort Niagara naturally holds the principal place in his pages and the local coloring of that lonely post tinges them all. He has drawn freely from the Jesuit Relations and other original sources. His essays are of unequal worth. "The Cross Bearers" is an attempt to specify the work of all the early missionaries. Father Dallion (1626) the first white man *known* to have visited the region (for of Brulé whom Parkman calls "that Pioneer of Pioneers," we have little real knowledge), the Jesuit Brébeuf, one of the grandest figures in the annals of the Order, Dollier, De Gallinée, La Salle, Hennepin, Gabriel (65 years old when he stepped upon the banks of Niagara), Watteux, Lamberville, and all the heroic band of seventeenth-century workers live again in these pages. The second essay relates, in fictitious narrative, the real conditions prevailing at the fort in 1687-88 during the French possession. "With Bolton at Fort Niagara" deals with the British occupation. It is drawn almost entirely from the Haldimand Papers of the British Museum, and is perhaps the most valuable portion of the book. Many will be surprised to learn that Hessians were employed at Niagara during the Revolution. Colonel Bolton found them most unsatisfactory soldiers and got rid of them as soon as possible. They would neither fight Indians nor work on fortifications and were continually selling their equipments for rum. Even their commander was officially reprimanded. It would appear that even in those heroic days advantage was sometimes taken of the "Noble Red Man." Experiments showed that garrison powder would throw a 46-lb. shell 240 yards—three times as far as powder issued to Indians would carry it. With musket balls the same remarkable difference was noted. Even garrison rum "carried" in similar proportions—suffering a change before passing from the commissary's hands, in which the Niagara played an important part. The paper compiled from the MS. journals of John Lay gives a glimpse of business conditions on the frontier in 1810-23

concerning which comparatively little is known. The other papers are of less worth because they treat of more familiar subjects ; but altogether, Mr. Severance may be congratulated on having accomplished in a very satisfactory way the task he marked out for himself.

WILFRED H. MUNRO.

Lights and Shadows of a Long Episcopate, being Reminiscences and Recollections of the Right Reverend Henry Benjamin Whipple, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Minnesota. (Macmillan, pp. vi, 576). This volume, whose appearance has been eagerly awaited, and which comes at the request of many friends, is a most welcome addition to American literature. It is the record of a varied and important life filled with heroic deeds and Christian charity. Bishop Whipple has had a wide and intimate acquaintance with the greatest statesmen, ecclesiastics and men of affairs in this country and abroad, and this book brings us into close touch with many of them, filled as it is with copies of autograph letters on most important subjects, and with interesting anecdotes of wit and wisdom.

In his ecclesiastical affairs Bishop Whipple, the pioneer Bishop of Minnesota, consecrated in 1859, shows the large charity and wide comprehensiveness of a true-hearted Christian, together with a wise, far-sighted administrative ability literally fulfilling Christ's injunction : "Be wise as serpents and harmless as doves." His diocesan seal, which adorns the cover of his book, is singularly appropriate and suggestive ; it is a peace-pipe crossing a broken tomahawk, and, just above it, the cross. The motto is : "Pax per sanguinem crucis."

To the historian, the chief interest centres about his great achievements in the cause of education and his grand work among the Indians.

On the high bluff which skirts the beautiful little city of Faribault, Minnesota, besides state institutions for the deaf and dumb, the blind and feeble-minded, are three large groups of buildings known as Bishop Whipple's schools. These are the Shattuck Military School for boys, with probably the finest group of school buildings in the United States, St. Mary's Hall, a school for girls, and the Seabury Divinity School for theological students. When John Walter, M.P., proprietor of the *London Times*, visited this country, he was advised by the Archbishop of Canterbury to visit these schools. On his return to Philadelphia from the West, he was asked by George W. Childs what had impressed him most. He replied : "The schools of Bishop Whipple in Faribault." To one who has seen them it is not surprising. This volume has among its illustrations, views of the fine buildings. Bishop Whipple significantly says : "On the site of the beautiful Shumway Memorial Chapel" (a perfect gem of architecture in the magnificent grounds of Shattuck School) "I witnessed a scalp dance in 1860."

Bishop Whipple's marvellous work among the Indians, so simply and graphically, yet so fascinatingly told in this book, will remain not only one of the most romantic and beautiful chapters in American history, but

also an unanswerable argument for the power of Christianity and the worth and efficiency of Christian missions, under apparently the most unfavorable conditions. How often by his personal bravery and Christian spirit of love and justice he saved this country from disgrace, and massacres, and the terrors of Indian warfare, cannot be known, but these pages record many startling instances.

The appendix of sixty-nine pages is a rare and most valuable collection of original documents on Indian affairs.

CHARLES L. WELLS.

A series of incidents, as casual and as lacking in significance as the occurrences which led up to the events which made the experience memorable, took a young American girl from her Paris schooling and landed her in the city of Mexico in 1862. The account of her experiences during the five years that followed, written thirty-five years later for the *Century Magazine*, and now expanded into a book, *Maximilian in Mexico*, by Sara Yorke Stevenson (New York, The Century Co., pp. 327), is in very many respects one of the most intelligible of the numerous accounts of what took place during that curious episode in the American drama. Writing from the standpoint of personal observation, Mrs. Stevenson has succeeded with quite unusual skill in maintaining the balance between what she saw and heard for herself, and what she, like others who study the affair, must have learned from the books in which those who participated officially have published their recollections of what they did. Knowing these participants, as table companions, partners at court balls, and as powerful protectors in times of serious danger, she has understood how to use their books, and the result is a clear, reasonable narrative of what happened, with some shrewd suggestions as to why. Her account, like most of those which are available to English or European readers, is written from the French side, the side of the story which must always chiefly excite curiosity. The pathetic martyrdom of the Emperor, whose stoic heroism at the end has been accepted as atonement for the years of indecision and inefficiency, and the controversies which grew out of the mutual recriminations of those who were variously responsible for the course of the disaster, are treated by Mrs. Stevenson with considerable appreciation of historic proportion, and she does the highest justice to most of the disputants by ignoring the details of their troubles altogether. The footlessness of the whole affair, the entire absence of justifying motive or of any sort of profit in the outcome to those who were responsible for the intervention, all that makes this episode the despair of those who would see some philosophy in history, were never more clearly shown than on Mrs. Stevenson's pages. It is only when one gets on the other side, and tries to understand what was happening to the Mexican people during these years of the Franco-Austrian Empire, that the meaning of it becomes visible. A year ago, the technically historical portion of Señor Romero's *Mexico and the United States* was noticed in this REVIEW. The other portion of that volume was a de-

scription of modern Mexico, the prosperous, hopeful, powerful nation which is attending so successfully to its own affairs in its own way. This Mexico of to-day was made by the French Intervention. Fifty years of unlicensed independence, liberty, freedom, or whatever it may be called, of petty politics and clever soldiering, of the rivalries and jealousies that always go with the absence of responsibility, had discredited Mexico as completely in the opinion of her own people as in that of the outside world. The national health required for its constitution a purging and a shock. The United States thought of stepping in to set things right; France actually intervened. The result, however unpleasant to France, made Mexico a nation.

Under Three Flags in Cuba; A Personal Account of the Cuban Insurrection and Spanish-American War, by George Clarke Musgrave. (Boston, Little, Brown and Co., pp. xvi., 366.) In the first two-thirds of this interesting volume, were names and dates omitted, one might imagine himself perusing the horrors of the Thirty Years' War, the ruthless devastations of Tilly and Wallenstein. Among our numerous war-books this one tells us most about the patriotic struggles of the Cubans prior to 1898, and about the iniquities practised upon them by that impulsive Spanish cleaving to Cuba whose superlative expression was found in Weyerism. Mr. Musgrave had peculiar advantages. Sent by an English service journal, he landed in Cuba "a warm sympathizer with Spain"; he served with the revolutionists and studied them and their cause; he repeatedly crossed the lines, underwent grievous danger and hardship, was wounded and imprisoned, was barely rescued from a spy's death and finally "deported to Spain," all prior to our declaration of war. Thus equipped, he gives us "a plain story of the sufferings and sacrifices of the Cubans for their freedom," and herein resides the chief value of the volume, intended for issue in 1898. To us Americans who have lived through a mighty war where humanity always triumphed, and where murder, rapine and arson did not follow in the path of armies, it is hard to believe that so much savagery could have been committed at our very doors during the past generation. Cuba was worked not to supply the Spanish treasury, but to enrich the officials temporarily in power there—in 1890 Pando told the Cortes of forty millions of dollars of recent defalcations. That the native Cuban, a descendant of Old Castile, should object to so many low-born Spaniards coming to despoil him, was not unnatural; but could any other of the civilized European nations have been guilty of such atrocities under the shadow of free America? And yet international courtesies in either continent must be maintained under trying conditions. All this is now past; let us look to it that our régime shall bear better fruit.

The sketches of Cuban troops and commanders, of character and manners, are interesting. The later chapters, devoted to the war, are less fresh. The graceful compliment paid to "the stupendous tasks at Santiago" and "the amazing valor of American soldiers" makes one

overlook the wearisome flings at Shafter; and a soldier, if not a war correspondent, knows that "defined strategic rules" have often to yield to circumstances, whatever "von Moltke may have advised in 1870." The moderate criticisms passed on our War Department were penned before the Boer campaign, and Englishmen now know more about the errors of war than then. With little else to criticize, this is a thoroughly readable book.

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

COMMUNICATIONS

1. *The Commune of London.*

As the point is of real historical importance, I desire to correct Dr. Gross's statement on page 744 of Volume V., and to explain how the case stands with regard to the "skevins" of London. The communal oath which I discovered bound those who took it to be obedient "maiori civitatis Lond[onie] et skivin[is] ejusdem commune." On this I observed that

"For the first time we learn that the government of the city was then in the hands of a Mayor and *échevins* (*skivini*). Of these latter officers no one, hitherto, had even suspected the existence. Dr. Gross, indeed, the chief specialist on English municipal institutions, appears to consider these officers a purely continental institution" (p. 237).

And I cited his footnotes on "their administrative and judicial functions in continental towns." It is an essential point in my case that the London "skevins" (previously unheard of) were "skevins" of the *Continental* type, forming part of the governing body of the Commune, and were not mere guild-officers, such as were the only "skevins" known to Dr. Gross in England. The index to his book (II. 443) distinguishes clearly between the two types.

Consequently, when he charges me with error on the ground that his book "calls particular attention to the existence of *échevins* in the guilds of many English boroughs," he shows that he has failed to grasp my point that the London "skevins" were not guild-officers at all, and that their Continental character strongly favors my theory of the foreign origin of this Commune.

I am also charged by him with error in stating that the possession of a port at Dowgate (London) by the citizens of Rouen, even under Edward the Confessor, was "a fact unknown to English historians," on the ground that "a book published by the Clarendon Press several years ago" sets it forth. But Dr. Gross's book (for it is his) does not mention Dowgate; he copied from Chérue! the erroneous reading "Dunegate" (I. 292).

J. H. ROUND.

2. *Letters to Washington.*

WITH reference to Mr. Ford's statement (V. 767) that Mr. S. M. Hamilton, in his *Letters to Washington*, Vol. II., "prints no less than five letters from Bosomworth as coming from Botomworth," the latter has sent to the managing editor tracings which show the captain's autograph and Washington's indorsement. The former might be read in either way; the latter is unmistakably "Captⁿ Botomworth." Another tracing shows clearly that the "impossible spelling" *Conogockuk* is that of the original manuscript.

NOTES AND NEWS

Preparations for the sixteenth annual meeting of the American Historical Association to be held at Detroit and Ann Arbor on Thursday, Friday and Saturday, December 27, 28, and 29, are well under way. The American Economic Association holds its annual meeting at the same time and place; arrangements have therefore been made for a joint session of the two societies in which subjects of common interest will be discussed. This joint session will be held in Ann Arbor, probably on the second day, and a special train will be provided to take the members back and forth from Detroit. While in Ann Arbor the Association will be the guest of the University of Michigan. The present indications are that the meeting will be largely attended and that the great body of western members who often find it difficult to be present at the eastern meetings will be well represented at Detroit. Preliminary programmes will be sent out soon after the first of November.

Professor Adolf Holm, author of a celebrated history of Sicily, died at Freiburg i. B. on June 3, aged nearly seventy. He was born in Lübeck, and was a teacher in its gymnasium when he wrote his history of Sicily in ancient times. He was called to be professor of ancient history in the University of Palermo, whence in 1884 he was called to Naples. With the Cavallari, father and son, he prepared a *Topografia Archeologica di Siracusa*; and he added a third volume to his Sicilian history, bringing the narrative down to the times of the Saracen conquests. In recent years his most notable work was his history of Greece, 1886-1894, which has been translated into English.

General Jacob D. Cox, an eminent public man, an excellent historical scholar, and a frequent though anonymous contributor to this journal, died on August 4, aged 71. He was a brigadier-general during the Civil War, governor of Ohio 1866-1867, Secretary of the Interior 1869-1870, and afterward a railroad president, a judge, a law professor and a college president. Lately he had lived in retirement at Oberlin. His historical books include *The March to the Sea*, 1882; *Atlanta*, 1882; and *The Battle of Franklin*, 1897.

Hon. Mellen Chamberlain, formerly chief-justice of the municipal court of Boston and librarian of the Boston Public Library, died on June 25, aged 79. An historical scholar of remarkable acuteness, grasp and breadth, he published but one important historical book, *John Adams, the Statesman of the Revolution, with other Essays and Addresses*, 1898.

Mr. William Henry Whitmore died on June 14. He was at one time an editor of the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, founded the *Heraldic Journal*, and was one of the founders of the *Historical Magazine*, as also of the Prince Society and the Boston Antiquarian Society. He was a genealogist of note, and published a well-known catalogue, entitled the *American Genealogist*. He also wrote *The Cavalier Dismounted; Elements of Heraldry*; and a *History of the Old State House, Boston*.

John C. Ridpath, author of a *Popular History of the United States*, 1881, and of many popular histories and text-books, died on July 31, aged 59. He was for a time professor of history at Asbury (now De-Pauw) University.

Professor Turner of the University of Wisconsin has gone abroad for a year; during his absence a portion of his work will be performed by Dr. Carl Russell Fish.

Dr. Herbert Friedenwald has resigned his position as chief of the manuscript department in the Library of Congress, and has been succeeded by Professor Faulkner of the University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. William E. Dodd, of North Carolina, has been called to the new chair of history and economics in Randolph-Macon College.

Dr. N. M. Trenholme has been elected professor of history at the Western University, London, Ontario.

The Macmillan Company have in press a work on *Historical Jurisprudence* by Guy Carleton Lee, of the historical department of Johns Hopkins University. It is intended to serve as an introduction to the systematic study of the growth of law, tracing the contributions made by each race to the science of jurisprudence.

One of Putnam's recent publications (London: T. Fisher Unwin), is *A Brief History of Eastern Asia*, by I. C. Hannah, the material for which was collected while the author was master of the English school at Tientsin. Mr. Hannah begins with prehistoric times and, with great brevity, traces the history of the Asiatic civilizations to the present day.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

A new fascicule of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* has appeared, devoted to Himyaritic and Sabaeen inscriptions.

To the May number of the *Classical Review* Mr. Thomas Ashby contributes a general account of the results of all the latest excavations at Rome.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

In the *Abhandlungen* of the Royal Society of Göttingen, phil.-hist. Cl., III. 3, Dr. H. Achelis has a treatise of 247 pp. on the martyrologies, their history and their historical value, and the relation of the Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum* to the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*.

In the *Neues Archiv*, XXV. 3, J. Schwalm publishes seventeen royal diplomas and Acta Imperii (1198-1338) discovered by him in an Italian journey in 1898; F. Philippi essays to disprove the authenticity of Norbert's *Vita Bennonis*; and K. Zeumer reduces from the tenth century to the twelfth the Alemannic code called *Jura Curiae in Munchwilare* published last year by E. Gothein.

The Ford lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in Lent term, 1900, by Mr. James Hamilton Wylie, have been published (Longmans) under the title *The Council of Constance to the Death of John Hus*.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY.

It is announced that the first volume of Lord Acton's *General History of Modern Times* may be expected to appear this autumn, published in this country by The Macmillan Company.

Dr. H. Hüffer, who is engaged upon an extensive documentary publication of the war of 1799 and 1800, prints in the *Mittheilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XXI., several essays on Suvorov's campaign in Switzerland in the autumn of 1799, on which he also had contributions in the *Revue Historique* for March. It is made plain, among other things, that Suvorov knew perfectly well that the St. Gotthard road had no continuation beyond the southern end of the Lake of the Four Cantons.

Dr. Hervey M. Bowman's monograph on *The Preliminary Negotiations of the Peace of Amiens*, in the University of Toronto series, which we expect to review in our next number, is to appear shortly in French, in a translation by Lieutenant Grosjean, of the 28th Dragoons in the French army.

Messrs. E. P. Dutton and Co. have ready for publication *The Campaign of 1815—Ligny, Quatre-Bras, Waterloo*, by Judge William O'Connor Morris, who combines a narrative of the campaign of 1815 with a running commentary on the military operations.

Rand, McNally and Co. (New York and Chicago) have published *Twenty Years in Europe; a Consul-General's Memories of Noted People, with Letters from General W. T. Sherman*. The time covered by this journal is from 1869 to 1891; the author was during that time United States Consul-General to Switzerland and Italy. General Sherman was his intimate friend, and the book contains some fifty of his letters.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. Rübsam, *Aus der Urzeit der modernen Post*, 1425-1562 (*Historisches Jahrbuch*, XXI. 1).

GREAT BRITAIN.

The British Government has published *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, Vol. XX., 1590-91; *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward III.*, 1340-1343; *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, Charles I.*, 1625-1632; *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of the Duke*

of *Portland*, Vol. V.; *Report on Manuscripts in the Welsh Language*, Vol. I., Part II.; and Vol. VIII. (1598) of the *Report on the MSS. of the Marquis of Salisbury*.

Volume LXIII. of the *Dictionary of National Biography* is now published. With this volume, which extends from Wordsworth to Zuyelestein, and which completes the dictionary, are published indexes for the first fourteen volumes, also an introduction giving an account of the inception of the work and its progress during the last eighteen years.

Mr. J. H. Round has in the press (Westminster, Constable) a volume of *Studies in Peerage and Family History*.

Messrs. Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co. are to publish the essay on *England under the Protector Somerset*, with which Mr. A. W. Pollard recently won the Arnold Prize at Oxford.

The Successors of Drake, by Julian Corbett (Longmans), designed as a concluding volume to the author's *Drake and the Tudor Navy*, is in press.

The Hakluyt Society has published *The Voyage of Robert Dudley, afterwards styled Earl of Warwick and Leicester and Duke of Northumberland, to the West Indies, 1594-1595, narrated by Captain Wyatt, by himself, and by Abram Kendall, Master*, edited by Mr. G. F. Warner of the British Museum (pp. lxvi, 104). Of the three narratives indicated, the first is derived from a Sloane MS., the second from the pages of Hakluyt, the third (practically a ruttier) is translated from Dudley's *Arcano del Mare*. The society has also issued *The Journey of William of Rubruck to the Eastern Parts of the World, 1253-1255, as narrated by himself, with two accounts of the earlier Journey of John of Pian de Carpine* (pp. lvi, 304), translated from the Latin and edited with great learning by Hon. W. W. Rockhill of the U. S. diplomatic service.

Messrs. Duckworth and Co. publish *A History of the Baronetage*, by Francis W. Pixley, F.S.A., registrar of the Honorable Society of the Baronetage. It appears that no history of the baronetage has previously been written. It must therefore be regarded as curious that simultaneously there should appear the first volume of a work called *The Complete Baronetage* (Exeter, Pollard) by G. E. C., author of *The Complete Peerage*. This first volume relates solely to the baronets of James I.'s creation.

The latest addition to the "Builders of Greater Britain" series (Longmans) is a volume on Sir Stamford Raffles by Mr. Hugh E. Egerton, author of the *Short History of English Colonial Policy*, reviewed in a previous issue of this REVIEW (IV. 588).

Under the title, *Our Fleet To-day, and its Development during the Last Half-Century*, Captain S. Eardley-Wilmot, R. N., has prepared a revised edition of his work *The Development of Navies during the Last Half-Century* (Seeley and Co.).

Messrs. Seeley and Co. publish *General John Jacob, Commandant of the Sind Irregular Horse and Founder of Jacobabad*, by Alexander Innes

Shand. General Jacob's career was a highly eventful one, and is traced from his early years to his death, at Jacobabad, in 1858. Mr. Shand has had access to the papers of General Jacob, in the possession of his niece, Mrs. Jacob, of Tavistock.

Under the title of *The Third Salisbury Administration, 1895-1900*, Messrs. Vacher and Co. will shortly publish a history of the present government, by Mr. H. Whates. Several maps, and appendices containing the text of all important diplomatic documents, will be contained in the work.

Sampson Low, Marston and Co. will publish, by arrangement with the London Times, *The Times History of the War in South Africa, 1899-1900*. This history will be a joint production of several of the special correspondents of *The Times* in South Africa, edited by L. S. Amery, Fellow of All Souls, Oxford. The work is expected to form five royal octavo volumes of about three hundred pages each.

The American Academy of Political and Social Science has published, as a supplement to its *Annals*, a useful pamphlet of 72 pages containing *Selected Official Documents of the South African Republic and Great Britain*, edited by Messrs. Hugh Williams and Frederick C. Hicks of the Library of Congress. Here will be found the Convention of 1884, the constitutions of the South African Republic and the Orange Free State, the law of the former for the establishment of the Second Volksraad, its franchise law and the alternative proposals of the two governments for its modification, Kruger's ultimatum and England's reply, and the analogous final communications between England and the Orange Free State.

A forthcoming book, of much present interest and importance, is Mr. Alexander Michie's *The English in China during the Victorian Era, as illustrated in the Life of Sir Rutherford Alcock, K.C.B.*, who, it will be remembered, was for many years British minister in China and Japan.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Miss E. A. McArthur, *The Regulation of Wages in the Sixteenth Century* (*English Historical Review*, July); R. S. Rait, *The Scottish Parliament before the Union of the Crowns*, II. (*ibid.*); B. Williams, *The Foreign Policy of England under Walpole*, II. (*ibid.*)

FRANCE.

M. Louis Clément, in an interesting thesis, *Henri Estienne et son Œuvre Française* (Paris, Picard, pp. 538), discourses upon his subject from both the historical and the literary and philological points of view.

M. Alexandre Tausserat-Radel has edited for the *Inventaire Analytique des Archives des Affaires Étrangères* two volumes of the *Correspondance Politique de Guillaume Pellicier, Ambassadeur de France à Venise* (Paris, Alcan, pp. 810), important for the history of the relations of France with Venice and the Orient from 1540 to 1542 and for the history of humanism.

Under the title *Le Drame des Poisons* (Paris, Hachette) M. Funck-Brentano constructs, upon the basis of his researches in the Bastille papers, an interesting and authoritative narrative of the case of the Marquise de Brinvilliers and of the great poisoning cases of 1678-1682.

M. Louis Wiesener has finished, by the publication of a third volume (Paris, Hachette, pp. 503) his important work on *Le Régent, l'Abbé Dubois et les Anglais*, an elaborate examination and defence of the policy of Orleans and Dubois based on the documents possessed by the English Public Record Office and the present Earl of Stair as well as on French sources.

Though refused the use of the family documents, M. Paul Gaffarel has succeeded in making a valuable book of his *Prieur de la Côte-d'Or* (Paris, Rousseau, pp. 354), describing the activity of Prieur in the Legislative Assembly and the Convention, his work on behalf of the metric system, and especially his important labors, as a member of the Committee of Public Safety, in providing munitions of war and organizing their manufacture.

M. Charles-Louis Chassin has completed, by the issue of an eleventh or index-volume, his monumental *Études Documentaires sur la Vendée et la Chouannerie* (Paris, Dupont).

The most important recent books upon the military history of the Napoleonic period are M. Félix Bouvier's *Bonaparte en Italie, 1796* (Paris, Léopold Cerf, pp. 745) and a new volume by M. Chuquet, *L'Alsace en 1814* (Paris, Plon, pp. 479).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Lot, *Études sur Merlin; Les Sources de la Vita Merlini* (Annales de Bretagne, April, July); B. de Mandrot, *Sur l'Autorité Historique de Philippe de Commines* (Revue Historique, July, September); A. Tilley, *Humanism under Francis I.* (English Historical Review, July); H. Gelin, *Madame de Maintenon Convertisseuse* (Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, 1900, 4 and 5); H. Sée, *Les Idées Politiques de Fénelon* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, I. 6); Father P. Bliard, *Dubois et l'Alliance de 1717* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); A. Cans, *Les Idées de Talleyrand sur la Politique Coloniale de la France au lendemain de la Révolution* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, II. 1); G. de Nouvion, *Talleyrand Prince de Bénévent* (Revue Historique, July, September); Général Ducrot, *M. Thiers et le Général Ducrot pendant la Commune* (Le Correspondant, May 25).

ITALY.

A new edition of Muratori's *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, edited by Giosuè Carducci, with as many as possible of the texts corrected by the aid of modern editions (though apparently without new collations with the manuscripts), is projected by the publishing house of S. Lapi at Città di Castello.

The Verein für Reformationsgeschichte publishes, as Heft 65, an excellent monograph by Dr. Karl Benrath, *Julia Gonzaga, ein Lebensbild aus der Geschichte der Reformation in Italien* (Halle, Niemeyer, pp. 127), which is in a way a companion to Agostini's recent book on Carnesecchi and Valdes.

One more of the republics subsidiary to the French has found its historian, in M. A. Dufourcq, whose *Le Régime Jacobin en Italie, Étude sur la République Romaine, 1798-1799* (Paris, Perrin) is a thorough work of great value based on researches in the archives of Paris, Rome and Vienna and the papers of Berthier.

The Macmillan Company have published *The Venetian Republic, Its Rise, Its Growth and Its Fall*, by W. Carew Hazlitt. The work is in two octavo volumes, and covers the period from 421 to the fall of the Republic, in 1797; it should not be confused with Mr. Hazlitt's earlier brief *History of the Venetian Republic*, published in 1860. It is founded on that book; but it is brought down to a later time, and it is enlarged, especially by the addition of chapters relating to economic and social history.

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND.

The committee for the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* have in press Vol. IV. of the Merovingian lives of saints, ed. Krusch, Part I. of the Carolingian diplomata, and the separate edition of Hrotsvitha. They announce the preparation of *Carmina Selecta Aetatis Romanae Extremae*, ed. Vollmer and Traube; *Liber Pontificalis, Vitae Gregorii*, etc., ed. Brackmann; Vol. V. of the Merovingian saints' lives, ed. Levison; Vol. XXXI. of the *Scriptores*, ed. Holder-Egger, comprising the Annales Cremonenses, Sicard of Cremona, the chronicle of Reggio, and Salimbene; Cosmas of Prague and his continuators, ed. Bretholz; *Leges Visigothorum*, ed. Zeumer; Vol. VI. of the *Epistolae*, comprising the letters of Abbot Lupus of Ferrières and Popes Nicholas I. and Hadrian II.; and a volume of pre-Carolingian poems and mortuary inscriptions, ed. Traube. Professor Harry Bresslau has been completing Vol. IV. of the *Diplomata* (Conrad II. and Henry III.) by a prolonged journey of research in Italy.

In the *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Alterthum*, VI. 3, Dr. F. Keutgen presents a valuable survey of the present state of the question of the origin of the constitutions of the German towns.

In the *Katholik* for May Dr. Kirsch publishes, for the first time from the original manuscript, Melanchthon's letter of June 16, 1525, to Camerarius respecting Luther's marriage, a letter hitherto known only in the garbled form in which Camerarius gave it out for publication.

The varying relations between Thomasius and the pietists and mystics are discriminatingly considered by Dr. R. Kayser in the programme of the Wilhelm-Gymnasium at Hamburg, *Christian Thomasius und der Pietismus* (pp. 32).

Professor Kaufmann's *Politische Geschichte Deutschlands im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Berlin, Bondi), is the fourth volume of a series which purports to cover the national progress of the Germans during the last hundred years. This volume is a book of 700 pages, octavo, and deals with tendencies, processes, and results, rather than with simple facts.

In the *Deutsche Revue* for April Dr. Horst Kohl publishes a dozen letters of the finance-minister Karl von Bodelschwingh and ten letters of the minister Von der Heydt, addressed to Bismarck in the sixties. They are of considerable historical interest. In the same journal for May is printed a letter of Bismarck to Prince Reuss, ambassador in Vienna, written in 1884, and revealing Bismarck's opinion of Busch and his writings.

Messrs. Harper and Brothers have just ready a collection of *Conversations with Prince Bismarck*, translated by Mr. Sidney Whitman from several of Herr von Poschinger's books.

It will, we believe, be of use to many readers to be informed of the admirable short sketch of Austrian history which Dr. Franz von Krones has published in two small volumes entitled *Österreichische Geschichte von der Urzeit bis 1526* and *Österreichische Geschichte von 1526 bis zur Gegenwart* (Leopzig, Göschen, pp. 104, 106). The non-Austrian lands held by the Austrian crown are included.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Priebsch, *Staat und Kirche in der Mark Brandenburg am Ende des Mittelalters* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XXI. 1); E. Daniels, *Friedrich der Grosse und Maria Theresia am Vorabend des siebenjährigen Krieges* (Preussische Jahrbücher, C. 1); R. Koser, *Die preussischen Finanzen im siebenjährigen Kriege* (Forschungen zur brandenburgischen und preussischen Geschichte, XIII. 1); O. Küntzel, *Friedrich der Grosse am Schlusse des siebenjährigen Krieges und des russischen Bündnisses* (Forschungen zur brandenburgischen und preussischen Geschichte, XIII. 1).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM.

The fourth volume of Professor Fredericq's monumental *Corpus Documentorum Inquisitionis Neerlandicae* (Ghent, Vuylsteke, pp. 553), comprises the period from 1514 to 1525. One of the most curious documents is the reprint of a rare tract by William Gnapheus, giving the examinations by the inquisitors of Jan de Backer of Woerden, a priest who had embraced Lutheranism. Students of the period will find in Professor Fredericq's volumes an enormous amount of important material, much of which is from unedited sources.

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.

Under the title *L'Odysée d'un Ambassadeur: Les Voyages du Marquis de Nointel, 1670-1680* (Paris, Plon, pp. 355), M. Albert Vandal has described from the original documents the career of a remarkable

ambassador who, after concluding the treaty of 1673 with the grand-vizier Ahmed Köpröli, devoted himself to an elaborate tour in Asia Minor and the Levant and Greece. The celebrated drawings of the Parthenon attributed to Carrey were executed under his orders.

The July number of the *Revue Historique* contains a summary review of Rumanian historical publications of the years 1894-1898 by Messrs. A. D. Xenopol and D. A. Teodoru.

AMERICA.

Mr. Warren K. Moorehead and others have published (Cincinnati, Robert Clarke Co.) *Prehistoric Implements*; a reference-book describing the ornaments, utensils and implements of pre-Columbian man in America. Mr. Moorehead has been assisted in his work by Professor Perkins, Drs. L. G. Yates and R. Steiner, and others, who have written special chapters. The book has 621 illustrations showing 3000 specimens.

No. 104 of the Old South Leaflets contains Jefferson's inaugural addresses. No. 105 is *An Account of Louisiana*, 1803, from a public document then printed; No. 106 is a portion of Calhoun's *Discourse on the Constitution and Government of the United States*.

The *International Monthly* for September contains an interesting article on "The American School of Historians," by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, of Harvard University.

The extracts from the sources of American history prepared by Professor Howard W. Caldwell of the University of Nebraska are now issued (by Ainsworth of Chicago) in a single volume, which includes two series of ten numbers each, one "A Survey of American History," the other on "American Territorial Development."

Numbers 2, 3, and 4 of Volume XII. of the Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law (Macmillan) are *Colonial Immigration Laws; a Study of the Regulation of Immigration by the English Colonies in America*, by Mr. Emberson E. Proper; *History of Military Pension Legislation in the United States*, by Mr. W. H. Glasson; *History of the Theory of Sovereignty since Rousseau*, by Mr. C. E. Merriam.

Mr. J. Henry Lea's *Genealogical Gleanings among the English Archives*, now in course of publication in the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, are wholly occupied in the July number with the family of William Penn. An English genealogist, Mr. William Ferguson Irvine, supplies an entry from the parish register of Warrington which may possibly record the marriage of the parents of the Rev. Richard Mather.

The United States Naval Academy, by Mr. Park Benjamin (G. P. Putnam's Sons), is mainly a history of the Academy at Annapolis, although the book gives a short description of the life and education of midshipmen before the Academy was called into existence.

A third edition of Mr. Thomas Hudson McKee's manual *The National Conventions and Platforms of all Political Parties, 1789-1900* (Baltimore, Friedenwald Co.) has just been published. The collection is thus brought down to date.

Messrs. Little, Brown and Co. announce a *Life of Francis Parkman*, by Charles Haight Farnham, who has had much assistance from the historian's family and friends.

The Macmillan Company will publish next month *Stage-Coach and Tavern Days*, by Mrs. Alice Morse Earle.

The Helman-Taylor Co. (Cleveland) have ready *An Historical Account of the Settlement of the Scotch Highlanders in America, prior to the Peace of 1783*, by J. P. MacLean.

Mr. George Parker Winship, librarian of the John Carter Brown Library, at Providence, will shortly publish (London, Stevens) a volume of *Cabot Bibliography*, with an essay on the career of the Cabots. The book will be printed at the Chiswick Press.

Under the title of *The Fight with France for North America*, Messrs. Archibald Constable are about to publish a short history, by A. G. Bradley, of the struggle between England and France for supremacy in North America. Mr. Bradley wrote the book on General Wolfe in the series of "Men of Action."

Professor Marseille, rector of the Bismarck Gymnasium at Pyritz, Pomerania, has recently published the diary of a Hessian officer, Captain Freiherr von Dörnberg, who served in the American War, at the siege of Charleston and afterwards on the staff of General Knyphausen.

A Life of John Paul Jones, in two volumes, by Augustus C. Buell, has been published by Charles Scribner's Sons. Mr. Buell has discovered in Russia new material relating to Jones's services in the imperial navy.

A former number of this REVIEW, V. 290-319, contained an interesting selection from the diary of Philip Vickers Fithian, A.B., Princeton, 1772. It is now announced that the whole diary, with portions of the author's correspondence, will be published at Princeton this autumn by the Princeton Historical Society, *Philip Vickers Fithian, Journal and Letters, 1767-1774*, edited by Mr. John Rogers Williams, to whom we are indebted for the portion which we were privileged to print.

The Funk and Wagnalls Co. (New York) have published a *Jeffersonian Cyclopedia*, being a comprehensive collection of the views of Thomas Jefferson, classified and arranged in alphabetical order under nine thousand titles. The work is edited by Mr. John P. Foley.

Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin and Co. announce *A Century of American Diplomacy*, by the Hon. John W. Foster, formerly Secretary of State. This volume is concerned with the diplomatic relations of the United States from 1776 to 1876.

Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons will publish at once *A History of Political Parties in the United States*, by the Hon. James H. Hopkins, formerly a representative from Pennsylvania. Another *History of Political Parties*, by Professor Wilbur F. Gordy, will shortly be published by Messrs. Henry Holt and Co. The Macmillan Co. announce *The American Party System from 1846 to 1861*, by Professor Jesse Macy of Iowa College.

Messrs. McClure, Phillips and Co. have acquired publication rights of a remarkable book which claims Abraham Lincoln as its author. It is a small scrap-book, compiled by Lincoln for use in the political campaign of 1858, with explanatory notes and a long letter in Lincoln's handwriting. The book was given to one of Lincoln's supporters, and it is with his sons that the present facsimile publication has been arranged.

Crane and Co. (Topeka) have in preparation the original letters and papers of John Brown and his family, and of the men who were with him in the Harper's Ferry raid, from material in the collection of the Kansas Historical Society. The book will be edited by Col. Richard J. Hinton, author of *John Brown and His Men*, and Mr. William E. Connelley of Topeka.

Dr. Thomas H. Featherstonhaugh, of Washington, D. C., is preparing a book on John Brown's Harper's Ferry raid. He has already published two interesting pamphlets of bibliography.

Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin and Co. announce *The Monitor and the Navy under Steam*, by Mr. Frank M. Bennett. The author traces the development of the navy of the United States from the battle of Hampton Roads to that off Santiago.

Recollections of a Lifetime, by Roeliff Brinkerhoff, (Cincinnati, Robert Clarke Co.) covers the last half of the present century. The author served in the Quartermaster's department during the civil war, and has been prominent as lawyer, editor and philanthropist. Among his friends were Chase, Blaine and Garfield.

An American Commoner: the Life and Times of Richard Parks Bland, by W. V. Byars (Columbia, Mo., E. W. Stephens), purports to be a study of the last quarter of the nineteenth century. It is published with an introduction by William Jennings Bryan, and Mrs. Bland has contributed her personal reminiscences.

Dr. C. L. Nichols has published a *Bibliography of Worcester: List of Books, Pamphlets, Newspapers and Broad-sides, printed in the Town of Worcester, Mass., from 1775 to 1848, with Historical and Explanatory Notes* (Worcester, Mass.), a bibliographical work prepared with unusual care.

E. A. Hall and Co. (Greenfield, Mass.) have published the *History of the Town of Sunderland, Massachusetts*, including the present towns

of Montague and Leverett, by Mr. J. Montague Smith ; with genealogies prepared by H. W. Taft and Abbie T. Montague.

The *Publications of the Rhode Island Historical Society* for July contains "A Briefe Narrative of the Nanhiganset Countrey," by Francis Brinley, 1696, and a series of documents illustrating the process by which Rhode Island, after ratifying the Constitution, was adjusted into the Union. The October number contains ten letters of Roger Williams hitherto unpublished, and a list of all others that have been printed since the issue of the Narraganset Club edition of his *Writings*.

Messrs. Norman M. Isham and Albert F. Brown have brought out (Providence, Preston and Rounds Co.) a work entitled *Early Connecticut Houses ; an Historical and Architectural Study*, which extends to Connecticut the plan followed by the authors in their similar work on the houses of Rhode Island.

Mr. Francis Olcott Allen has, in the publication of the first volume of his *History of Enfield, Conn., 1679-1850* (Philadelphia), contributed a welcome addition to American local history. Exhaustive copies of land-surveys and lay-outs, of town acts and votes are given. This volume includes a *Historical Sketch of the Town of Enfield*, written in 1829 by John Chauncey Pease, M.D.

An historical essay on *The Hiding of the Charter*, by Dr. Charles J. Hoadly, is announced as the second publication of the Acorn Club of Hartford.

The *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library for June contains a further installment of the letters of Jackson ; that for September a very interesting calendar of the Jackson-Lewis papers. The July number prints several letters of Senator James A. Bayard, 1802-1814.

The July number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History* is accompanied with the proceedings of the Historical Society in memory of the late Dr. Charles J. Stillé. Of the new matters in the magazine the most interesting is a small group of letters addressed to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel by one of its missionaries, the Rev. Griffith Hughes, who preached among the Welsh settlers near Radnor from 1733 to 1736, when he retired to Barbadoes. Much of the contents of the number is genealogical. There is historical as well as genealogical interest in the various lists printed—of the settlers of Darby Township from 1681, of foreigners who arrived at Philadelphia in 1791-1792, of Pennsylvania ships registered from 1742 to 1745.

Messrs. George W. Jacobs and Co. (Philadelphia) publish *A History of the University of Pennsylvania*, by Thomas Harrison Montgomery. The book covers the period from the foundation of "The Publick Academy in the City of Philadelphia" in 1749, to 1770. It presents an

extensive array of documents and details, together with "biographical sketches of the Trustees, Faculty, the first Alumni, and others."

The Historical Society of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, has published its second volume of *Historical Sketches* (Norristown, pp. 386), containing papers by General W. W. H. Davis on the battle of the Crooked Billet; by L. Streeper and I. C. Williams on Lafayette at Barren Hill; and other papers relating chiefly to the Revolutionary history of the region.

Messrs. Henry Holt and Co. will publish, this fall, *The German and Swiss Settlements of Pennsylvania*, by Professor L. O. Kuhns, of Wesleyan University.

Mrs. Jane Baldwin, of Annapolis, Md., will publish for subscribers *The Maryland Calendar of Wills—a ready, accurate, and complete Abstract of the Wills probated in Maryland from the Time of its Settlement, 1634, to the American Revolution*. The edition will be limited to three hundred copies.

The July number of the *Virginia Magazine of History* contains some entertaining letters written in 1781-1783 from Paris by Mrs. Ralph Izard of South Carolina to Mrs. William Lee of Virginia; an inventory of the large estate left by Thomas Lord Fairfax in 1782; a series of notes made by the late Conway Robinson from the records of the Council and General Court of Virginia, from 1641 to 1659; Sainsbury abstracts, relating to 1631 and to the attempt to revive the Virginia Company; and continuations of the Nansemond and Nicholson documents. The latter are of value for the history of the Virginia clergy. Mr. Robinson's notes present a tantalizing array of references to documents once existing but unhappily destroyed in 1865. Every part of the magazine bears evidence of the great fund of local knowledge possessed by the editor, Mr. W. G. Stanard.

The *North Carolina Historical and Genealogical Register*, a new venture among historical journals, contains in its first number an abstract of land-grants for Chowan County, extending from 1679 to 1803, abstracts of wills probated and recorded by the secretary of the colony from 1678 to 1760, and other such materials.

The *Publications of the Southern History Association*, which have now become bi-monthly, contained in the May issue the journal of Thomas Nicholson, a travelling preacher of the Society of Friends, a journal consisting of three fragments, one relating to a visit to Friends on Cape Fear in 1746, one to a journey to England in 1749-1751 and the third to a visit to the Assembly of 1771. It is the earliest of journals of Southern Quakers. A further instalment appears in the July number, and continuation is promised.

The North Carolina Law Journal contains an article entitled *North*

Carolina and the Adoption of the Constitution of the United States, by Professor K. P. Battle of the University of North Carolina.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, No. 3, (July), contains continuations of the papers of the first Council of Safety and of those relating to the mission of Col. John Laurens to Europe in 1781. It also prints two very interesting letters of Justice William Johnson of the Supreme Court of the United States, addressed to Jefferson in 1823.

The *Charleston Year Book* for 1899 publishes as an appendix the Official Correspondence between Brigadier-General Thomas Sumter and Major-General Nathanael Greene, 1780 to 1783, from original unpublished letters loaned by the Misses Brownfield and by General Edward McCrady.

Judge Bethel Coopwood's dissertation on the route of Cabeza de Vaca is continued in the July number of the *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association*, which also contains some characteristic reminiscences of Judge Edwin Waller of Austin.

The papers of M. B. Lamar, first president of the republic of Texas, have lately been deposited with the State Librarian, and appear to be of great historical value.

It is announced that Senator John H. Reagan of Texas, the only surviving member of the Confederate Cabinet, is writing his recollections of the Civil War.

The present month will see the dedication at Madison of the magnificent new building which will contain the library of the State Historical Society and that of the University of Wisconsin. The principal historical address will be delivered by Mr. Charles Francis Adams, president of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

The July number of the *Annals of Iowa*, contains an article upon Lincoln at Council Bluffs, in 1859, and also one upon Gen. Nathaniel Lyon.

The *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society*, No. 2 (June) contains a valuable article on Our Public Land System and its Relation to Education in the United States, by Mrs. Frances Fuller Victor, and a narrative of events in early Oregon ascribed to Dr. John McLoughlin and supposed to have been written by him for purposes of defence.

Professor Blake of the Territorial University, Tucson, Arizona, and geologist of the territory, is engaged upon a complete bibliography of the territory, with especial reference to the Indian tribes, cliff-dwellers, and Pueblos.

In the July-October number of the *Canadian Antiquarian and*

Numismatic Journal the chief article is one by Mr. Justice Baby, on "L'Exode des Classes Dirigeantes à la Cession du Canada."

The Remarkable History of the Hudson's Bay Company, by Dr. George Bryce (Scribner's), is a book which has been many years in preparation. It deals chiefly with the operations of the Company since 1750, and therefore supplements, rather than rivals, *The Great Company* of Mr. Beckles Willson. A classified bibliography of literature relating to the Northwest is furnished.

The
American Historical Review

THE SIFTED GRAIN AND THE GRAIN SIFTERS¹

ON occasions such as this, a text upon which to discourse is not usual ; I propose to venture an exception to the rule. I shall, moreover, offer not one text only, but two ; taken, the first, from a discourse prepared in the full theological faith of the seventeenth century, the other from the most far-reaching scientific publication of the century now drawing to its close.

"God sifted a whole Nation that He might send choice Grain over into this Wilderness," said William Stoughton in the election sermon preached according to custom before the Great and General Court of Massachusetts in April, 1668. To the same effect Charles Darwin wrote in 1871 : "There is apparently much truth in the belief that the wonderful progress of the United States, as well as the character of the people, are the results of natural selection ; for the more energetic, restless and courageous men from all parts of Europe have emigrated during the last ten or twelve generations to that great country and have there succeeded best ;" and the quiet, epoch-marking, creed-shaking naturalist then goes on to express this startling judgment, which, uttered by an American, would have been deemed the very superlative of national vanity : —"Looking to the distant future, I do not think [it] an exaggerated view [to say that] all other series of events—as that which resulted in the culture of mind in Greece, and that which resulted in the Empire of Rome—only appear to have purpose and value when viewed in connection with, or rather as subsidiary to, the great stream of Anglo-Saxon emigration to the West."²

Such are my texts ; but, while I propose to preach from them largely and to them in a degree, I am not here to try to instruct

¹ An Address at the Dedication of the Building of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin at Madison, October 19, 1900.

² *The Descent of Man* (ed. 1874), II. 218, 219.

you to-day in the history of your own state of Wisconsin, or in the magic record relating to the development of what we see fit to call the Northwest. Indeed I am not here as an individual at all ; nor as one in any way specially qualified to do justice to the occasion. I am here simply as the head for the time being of what is unquestionably the oldest historical society in America, and, if reference is made to societies organized exclusively for the preservation of historical material and the furtherance of historical research, one than which few indeed anywhere in existence are more ancient of years. As the head of the Massachusetts Historical Society, I have been summoned to contribute what I may in honor of the completion of this edifice, the future home of a similar society, already no longer young ;—a society grown up in a country which, when the Massachusetts institution was formed, was yet the home of aboriginal tribes,—a forest-clad region known only to the frontiersman and explorer. Under such circumstances, I did not feel that I had a right not to answer the call. It was as if in our older Massachusetts time the pastor of the Plymouth, or of the Salem or Boston church had been invited to the gathering of some new brotherhood in the Connecticut Valley, or the lighting of another candle of the Lord on the Concord or the Nashua, there to preach the sermon of ordination and extend the right hand of fellowship.

And in this connection let me here mention one somewhat recondite historical circumstance relating to this locality. You here may be more curiously informed, but few indeed in Massachusetts are to-day knowing of the fact that this portion of Wisconsin—Madison itself, and all the adjoining counties—was once, territorially, a part of the royally assigned limits of Massachusetts. Yet such was undisputably the fact ; and it lends a certain propriety, not the less poetic because remote, to my acceptance of the part here to-day assigned me.

Accepting that part, I none the less, as I have said, propose to break away from what is the usage in such cases. That usage, if I may have recourse to an old theological formula, is to improve the occasion historically. An address, erudite and bristling with statistics, would now be in order. An address in which the gradual growth of the community or the institution should be developed, and its present condition set forth ; with suitable reference to the days of small things, and a tribute of gratitude to the founders, and those who patiently built their lives into the edifice, and made of it their monument. The names of all such should, I agree, be cut deep over its portico ; but this task, eminently proper on such occasions, I, a stranger, shall not undertake here and now to perform.

For it others are far better qualified. I do not, therefore, propose to tell you of the St. Francis Xavier mission at Green Bay, or of Nicollet; of Jacques Cartier, of Marquette or of Radisson, any more than of those two devoted benefactors and assiduous secretaries of this institution, Lyman C. Draper and Reuben G. Thwaites; but, leaving them, and their deeds and services, to be commemorated by those to the manner born, and, consequently, in every respect better qualified than I for the work, I propose to turn to more general subjects and devote the time allotted me to generalities, and to the future rather than to the past.

In an address delivered about eighteen months ago before the Massachusetts Historical Society, I discussed in some detail the modern conception of history as compared with that which formerly prevailed. I do not now propose to repeat what I then said. It is sufficient for my present purpose to call attention to what we of the new school regard as the dividing line between us and the historians of the old school, the first day of October, 1859,—the date of the publication of Darwin's "*Origin of Species*;" the book of his immediately preceding the "*Descent of Man*," from which my text for to-day was taken. On the first day of October, 1859, the Mosaic cosmogony finally gave place to the Darwinian theory of evolution. Under the new dispensation, based not on chance or an assumed supernatural revelation, but on a patient study of biology, that record of mankind known as history, no longer a mere succession of traditions and annals, has become a unified whole,—a vast scheme systematically developing to some result as yet not understood. Closely allied to astronomy, geology and physics, the study of modern history seeks a scientific basis from which the rise and fall of races and dynasties will be seen merely as phases of a consecutive process of evolution,—the evolution of man from his initial to his ultimate state. When this conception was once reached, history, ceasing to be a mere narrative, made up of disconnected episodes having little or no bearing on each other, became a connected whole. To each development, each epoch, race and dynasty its proper place was to be assigned; and to assign that place was the function of the historian. Formerly each episode was looked upon as complete in itself; and, being so, it had features more or less dramatic or instructive, and, for that reason, tempting to the historian, whether investigator or literary artist,—a Freeman or a Froude. Now, the first question the historian must put to himself relates to the proper adjustment of his particular theme to the entire plan,—he is shaping the fragment of a vast mosaic. The incomparably greater portion of history has, it is needless to say,

little value,—not much more than the biography of the average individual ; it is a record of small accomplishment,—in many instances a record of no accomplishment at all, perhaps of retrogression ;—for we cannot all be successful, nor even everlastingly and effectively strenuous. Among nations in history, as among men we know, the commonplace is the rule ; but, whether ordinary or exceptional,—conspicuous or obscure,—each has its proper place, and to it that place should be assigned.

Having laid down this principle, I, eighteen months ago, proceeded to apply it to the society I was then addressing, and to the history of the commonwealth whose name that society bears ; and I gave my answer to it, such as that answer was. The same question I now put as concerns Wisconsin ; and to that also I propose to venture an answer. As my text has indicated, that answer, also, will not, in a sense, be lacking in ambition. In the history of Wisconsin I shall seek to find verification of what Darwin suggested,—evidence of the truth of the great law of natural selection as applied also to man.

Thus stated, the theme is a large one, and may be approached in many ways ; and, in the first place, I propose to approach it in the way usual with modern historical writers. I shall attempt to assign to Wisconsin its place in the sequence of recent development ; for it is only during the last fifty years that Wisconsin has exercised any, even the most imperceptible, influence on what is conventionally agreed upon as history. That this region before the year 1848 had an existence, we know ; as we also know that, since the last glacial period when the earth's surface hereabouts assumed its present geographical form,—some five thousand, or, perhaps, ten, or even twenty thousand years ago,—it has been occupied by human beings,—fire-making, implement-using, garment-wearing, habitation-dwelling. With these we have now nothing to do. We, the historians, are concerned only with what may be called the mere fringe of Time's raiment,—the last half-century of the fifty or one hundred centuries ; the rest belong to the ethnologist and the geologist, not to us. But the last fifty years, again, so far as the evolution of man from a lower to a higher stage of development is concerned, though a very quickening period, has, after all, been but one stage, and not the final stage, of a distinct phase of development. That phase has now required four centuries in which to work itself out to the point as yet reached ; for it harks back to the discovery of America, and the movement towards religious freedom which followed close upon that discovery, though having no direct connection with it. Martin Luther and Christo-

pher Columbus had little in common except that their lives overlapped ; but those two dates, 1492 and 1517,—the landfall at San Salvador and the theses nailed on the church door at Wittenberg,—those two dates began a new chapter in human history, the chapter in which is recounted the fierce struggle over the establishment of the principles of civil and religious liberty, and the recognition of the equality of men before the law. For, speaking generally but with approximate correctness, it may be asserted that, prior to the year 1500, the domestic political action and the foreign complications of even the most advanced nations turned on other issues,—dynastic, predatory, social ; but, since that date, from the wars of Charles V., of Francis I., and of Elizabeth down to our own Confederate rebellion, almost every great struggle or debate has either directly arisen out of some religious dispute or some demand for increased civil rights, or, if it had not there its origin, it has invariably gravitated in that direction. Even Frederick of Prussia, the so-called Great—that skeptical, irreligious cut-purse of the Empire,—the disciple and protector of Voltaire and the apotheosized of Thomas Carlyle,—even Frederick figured as “the Protestant Hero ;” while Francis I. was “the Eldest Son of the Church,” and Henry VIII. received from Rome the title of “Defender of the Faith.”

Since the year 1500, on the other hand, what is known as modern history has been little more than a narrative of the episodes in the struggle not yet closed against arbitrary rule, whether by a priesthood or through divine right, or by the members of a caste or of a privileged class,—whether ennobled, plutocratic or industrial. The right of the individual man, no matter how ignorant or how poor, to think, worship and do as seems to him best, provided always in so doing he does not infringe upon the rights of others, has through these four centuries been, as it still is, the underlying issue in every conflict. It seems likely, also, to continue to be the issue for a long time to come, for it never was more firmly asserted or sternly denied than now ; though to-day the opposition comes, not, as heretofore, from above, but from below, and finds its widest and most formidable expression in the teachings of those socialists who preach a doctrine of collectivism, or the complete suppression of the individual.

That proposition, however, does not concern us here and now. Our business is with the middle period of the nineteenth century, and not with the first half of the twentieth ; and no matter how closely we confine ourselves to the subject in hand, space and time will scarcely be found in which properly to develop the theme.

Two and fifty years ago, when, in the summer of 1848, Wisconsin first took shape as an organized political organization,—a new factor in man's development,—human evolution was laboring over two problems,—nationality and slavery. Slavery—that is, the ownership of one man or one class of men by another man or class of men—had existed, and been accepted as a matter of course, from the beginning. Historically the proposition did not admit of doubt. In Great Britain, bondage had only recently disappeared, and in Russia it was still the rule; while among the less advanced nations its rightfulness was nowhere challenged. With us here in America it was a question of race. The equality of whites before the law was an article of political faith; not so that of the blacks. The Africans were distinctly an inferior order of being, and, as such, not only in the Southern or slave states, but throughout the North also, not entitled to the unrestricted pursuit on equal terms of life, liberty and happiness. Hence a fierce contention,—the phase, as it presented itself on the land discovered by Columbus in 1492, of the struggle inaugurated by Luther in 1517. Its work was thus, so to speak, cut out for Wisconsin in advance of its being,—its place in the design of the great historical scheme prenatally assigned to it. How then did it address itself to its task? how perform the work thus given it to do? Did it, standing in the front rank of progress, help the great scheme along? Or, identifying itself with that reactionist movement ever on foot, did it strive with the stars in their courses?

Here, in the United States, the form in which the issue of the future took shape between 1830, when it first presented itself, and 1848, when Wisconsin entered the sisterhood of states, is even yet only partially understood, in such occult ways did the forces of development interact and exercise influence on each other. For reasons not easy to explain, also, certain states came forward as the more active exponents of antagonistic ideas,—on the one side Massachusetts; on the other, first, Virginia, and, later, South Carolina. The great and long sustained debate which closed in an appeal to force in the spring of 1861 must now be conceded as something well-nigh inevitable from fundamental conditions which dated from the beginning. It was not a question of slavery; it was one of nationality. The issue had presented itself over and over again, in various forms and in different parts of the country ever since the Constitution had been adopted,—now in Pennsylvania; now in Kentucky; now in New England; even here in Wisconsin; but, in its most concrete form, in South Carolina. It was a struggle for mastery between centripetal and centrifugal forces. At the close, slavery

was, it is true, the immediate cause of quarrel, but the seat of disturbance lay deeper. In another country, and under other conditions, it was the identical struggle which, in feudal times, went on in Great Britain, in France and in Spain, and which, more recently, and in our own day only, we have seen brought to a close in Germany and in Italy,—the struggle of a rising spirit of nationality to overcome the clannish instinct,—the desire for local independence. In the beginning Virginia stood forward as the exponent of state sovereignty. Jefferson was its mouthpiece. It was he who drew up the famous Kentucky resolutions of 1798–99, and his election to the presidency in 1800 was the recognized victory of the school of states' rights over Federalism. Later the parties changed sides,—as political parties are wont to do. Possession of the government led to a marked modification of views ; new issues were presented ; and, in 1807, the policy which took shape in Jefferson's Embargo converted the Federalist into a disunion organization, which disappeared from existence in the famous Hartford Convention of 1814–15. New England was then the centre of the party of the centrifugal force, and the issues were commercial. Fortunately, up to 1815 the issue between the spirit of local sovereignty and the ever-growing sense of nationality had not taken shape over any matter of difference sufficiently great and far-reaching to provoke an appeal to force. Not the less for that was the danger of conflict there,—a sufficient cause and suitable occasion only were wanting, and those under ordinary conditions might be counted upon to present themselves in due course of time. They did present themselves in 1832, still under the economical guise. But now the moral issue lurked behind, though the South did not yet stand directly opposed to the advancing spirit of the age. But nullification—the logical outcome of the theory of absolute state sovereignty—was enunciated by Calhoun, and South Carolina took from Virginia the lead in the reactionary movement from nationality. The danger once more passed away ; but it is obvious to us now, and, it would seem, should have been plain to any cool-headed observer then, that, when the issue next presented itself, a trial of strength would be well-nigh inevitable. The doctrine of state sovereignty, having assumed the shape of nullification, would next develop that of secession, and the direct issue over nationality would be presented.

Almost before the last indications of danger over the economical question had disappeared, slavery loomed ominously up. They did not realize it at the time, but it was now an angry wrangle over a step in the progressive evolution of the human race. The equality of man before the law and his Maker was insisted upon, and was

denied. It was a portentous issue, for in it human destiny was challenged. The desperate risk the Southern States then took is plain enough now. They entered upon a distinctly reactionary movement against two of the foremost growing forces of human development, the tendency to nationality and the humanitarian spirit. Though they knew it not, they were arraying themselves against the very stars in their courses.

Under these circumstances the secession-slavery movement between 1835 and 1860 was a predestined failure. Because of fortuitous events—the chances of the battle-field, the impulse of individual genius, the exigencies of trade or the blunders of diplomats—it might easily have had an apparent and momentary triumph; but the result upon which the slave power, as such, was intent,—the creation about the Gulf of Mexico and in the Antilles of a great semi-tropical nationality, based on African servitude and a monopolized cotton production,—this result was in direct conflict with the irresistible tendencies of mankind in its present stage of development. A movement in all its aspects radically reactionary, it could at most have resulted only in a passing anomaly.

While the Southern, or Jamestown, column of Darwin's great Anglo-Saxon migration was thus following to their legitimate conclusions the teachings of Jefferson and Calhoun,—the Virginia and South Carolina schools of state sovereignty, slavery and secession,—the distinctively northern column,—that entering through the Plymouth and Boston portals,—instinctively adhering to those principles of Church and State in the contention over which it originated,—found its way along the southern shores of the Great Lakes, through northern Ohio, southern Michigan, and northern Illinois, and then, turning north and west, spread itself over the vast region beyond the great lakes, and towards the upper waters of the Mississippi. But it is very noteworthy how the lead and inspiration in this movement still came from the original source. While in the South it passed from Virginia to Carolina, in the North it remained in Massachusetts. Three men then came forward there, voicing more clearly than any or all others what was in the mind of the community in the way of aspiration, whether moral or political. Those three were: William Lloyd Garrison, Daniel Webster and John Quincy Adams; they were the prophetic voices of that phase of American political evolution then in process. Their messages, too, were curiously divergent; and yet, apparently contradictory, they were, in reality, supplementary to each other. Garrison developed the purely moral side of the coming issue. Webster preached nationality, under the guise of love of the Union. Adams,

combining the two, pointed out a way to the establishment of the rights of man under the Constitution and within the Union. While, in a general way, much historical interest attaches to the utterances and educational influence of those three men during the period under discussion, the future political attitude of Wisconsin, then nascent, was deeply affected by them. To this subject, therefore, I propose to devote some space ; for, deserving attention, I am not aware that it has heretofore received it. In doing so I cannot ignore the fact of my own descent from one of the three I have named ; but I may say in my own extenuation that John Quincy Adams was indisputably a considerable public character in his time, and when I, a descendant of his, undertake to speak of that time historically, I must, when he comes into the field of discussion, deal with him as best I may, assigning to him, as to his contemporaries, the place which, as I see it, is properly his or theirs. Moreover, I will freely acknowledge that an hereditary affiliation, if I may so express it, was not absent from the feeling which impelled me to accept your call. However much others had forgotten it, I well remembered that more than half a century ago, in the days of small things, it was in this region, as in central New York and the Western Reserve, that the seed cast by one from whom I claim descent fell in the good ground where it bore fruit an hundred fold.

Recurring, then, to the three men I have named as voicing systematically a message of special significance in connection with the phase of political evolution, or of development if that word is preferred, then going on,—Garrison's message was distinctly moral and humanitarian. In a sense, it was reactionary, and violently so. In it there was no appeal to patriotism, no recognition even of nationality. On the contrary, in the lofty atmosphere of humanitarianism in which he had his being, I doubt if Garrison ever inhaled a distinctively patriotic breath ; while he certainly denounced the Constitution and assailed the Union. He saw only the moral wrong of slavery, its absolute denial of the fundamental principle of the equality of men before the law and before God ; and the world became his,—where freedom was there was his country. To arouse the dormant conscience of the community by the fierce and unceasing denunciation of a great wrong was his mission ; and he fulfilled it : but, curiously enough, the end he labored for came in the way he least foresaw, and through the very instrumentality he had most vehemently denounced,—it came within that Union which he had described as a compact with death, and under that Constitution which he had arraigned as a covenant with hell. Yet Garri-

son was undeniably a prophet, voicing the gospel as he saw it fearlessly and without pause. As such he contributed potently to the final result.

Next, Webster. It was the mission of Daniel Webster to preach nationality. In doing so he spoke in words of massive eloquence in direct harmony with the most pronounced aspiration of his time,—that aspiration which has asserted itself and worked the most manifest results of the nineteenth century in both hemispheres,—in Spain and Prussia during the Napoleonic war, in Russia during the long Slavonic upheaval, again more recently in Germany and in Italy, and finally in the United States. The names of Stein, of Cavour and of Bismarck are scarcely more associated with this great instinctive movement of the century than is that of Daniel Webster. His mission it was to preach to this people Union, one and indivisible ; and he delivered his message.

The mission of J. Q. Adams during his best and latest years, while a combination of that of the two others, was different from either. His message, carefully thought out, long retained, and at last distinctly enunciated, was his answer to the Jeffersonian theory of state sovereignty, and Calhoun's doctrine of nullification and its logical outcome, secession. With both theory and doctrine, and their results, he had during his long political career been confronted ; on both he had reflected much. It was during the administration of Jefferson and on the question of union that he had, in 1807, broken with his party and resigned from the Senate ; and with Calhoun he had been closely associated in the cabinet of Monroe. Calhoun also had occupied the vice-presidential chair during his own administration. He now met Calhoun face to face on the slavery issue, prophetically proclaiming a remedy for the moral wrong and the vindication of the rights of man, within the Union and under the Constitution, through the exercise of inherent war powers whenever an issue between the sections should assume the insurrectionary shape. In other words, Garrison's moral result was to be secured, not through the agencies Garrison advocated, but by force of that nationality which Webster proclaimed. This solution of the issue, J. Q. Adams never wearied of enunciating, early and late, by act, speech and letter ; and his view prevailed in the end. Lincoln's proclamation of January, 1863, was but the formal declaration of the policy enunciated by J. Q. Adams on the floor of Congress in 1836, and again in 1841, and yet again in greater detail in 1842.¹ It was he who thus brought the abstract moral doctrines of Garrison into unison of movement with the nationality of Webster.

¹ See Appendix, *post*.

The time now drew near when Wisconsin was to take her place in the Union, and exert her share of influence on the national polity, and through that polity on a phase of political evolution. South Carolina, by the voice of Calhoun, was preaching reaction, through slavery and in defiance of nationality : Massachusetts, through Garrison and Webster, was proclaiming the moral idea and nationality as abstractions ; while J. Q. Adams confronted Calhoun with the ominous contention that, the instant he or his had recourse to force, that instant the moral wrong could be made good by the sword wielded in defence of nationality and in the name of the Constitution.

As 1848 waxed old, the debate grew angry. J. Q. Adams died in the early months of that memorable year ; but his death in no way affected the course of events. The leadership in the anti-slavery struggle on the floor of Congress and within the limits of the Constitution had passed from him four years before. He was too old longer to bear the weight of armor, or to wield weapons once familiar ; but the effect of his teachings remained, and they were living realities wherever the New England column had penetrated, —throughout central New York, in the “ Western Reserve,” and especially in the region which bordered on Lake Michigan. Garrison still declaimed against the Union as an unholy alliance with sin ; while, in the mind of Webster, his sense of the wrong of slavery was fast being overweighted by apprehension for nationality. In the mean time, a war of criminal aggression against Mexico in behalf of Calhoun’s reactionary movement had been brought to a close, and the question was as to the partition of plunder. On that great issues hinged, and over it was fought the presidential election of 1848. A little more than fifty years ago, that was the first election in which Wisconsin participated. The number of those who now retain a distinct recollection of the canvass of 1848, and the questions then so earnestly debated are not many ; I chance to be one of those few. I recall one trifling incident connected, not with the canvass but with the events of that year, which, for some reason, made an impression upon me, and now illustrates curiously the remoteness of the time. I have said that J. Q. Adams died in February, 1848. Carried back with much funereal state from the Capitol at Washington to Massachusetts, he was in March buried at Quincy. An eloquent discourse was then delivered over his grave by the minister of the church of which the ex-President had been a member. He who delivered it was a scholar, as well as a natural orator of high order ; and, in the course of what he said he had occasion to refer to this remote region, then not yet admitted

to statehood, and he did so under the name of "the Ouisconsin." That discourse was delivered on the 11th of March, 1848; and, on the 29th of the following May, Wisconsin became a State.

Returning now to the presidential election of 1848, it will be found that Wisconsin, the youngest community in the Union, came at once to the front as the banner state of the West in support of the principles on which the Union was established, and the maintenance and vindication of those fundamental principles within the Union and through the Constitution. In that canvass the great issues of the future were distinctly brought to the front. The old party organizations then still confronted each other,—the Henry Clay Whigs were over against the Jacksonian Democracy; but in that election Lewis Cass, the legitimate candidate of the Democracy,—a Northern man with Southern principles,—so far as African slavery was concerned a distinct reactionist from the principles of the great Declaration of 1776,—Lewis Cass, of Michigan, was opposed to General Zachary Taylor, of Louisiana, himself a slaveholder, and nominated by a party which in presenting his name carefully abstained from any enunciation of political principles. He was an unknown political quantity; and no less a public character than Daniel Webster characterized his nomination as one not fit to be made. It yet remained to be seen that, practically, the plain, blunt, honest, well-meaning old soldier made an excellent President, whose premature loss was deeply and with reason deplored. His nomination, however, immediately after that of Cass, proved the signal for revolt. For the disciples of J. Q. Adams in both political camps it was as if the cry had again gone forth, "To your tents, O Israel!"—and a first fierce blast of the coming storm then swept across the land. In August the dissentients met in conference at Buffalo, and there first enunciated the principles of the American political party of the future,—that party which, permeated by the sentiment of Nationality, was destined to do away with slavery through the war power, and to incorporate into the Constitution the principle of the equality of man before the law, irrespective of color or of race. Now, more than half a century after the event, it may fairly be said of those concerned in the Buffalo movement of 1848 that they were destined to earn in the fulness of time the rare distinction of carrying mankind forward one distinct stage in the long process of evolution. In support of that movement Wisconsin was, as I have already said, the banner western state. In its action it simply responded to its early impulse received from New England and western New York. Thus the seed fell in fertile places and produced fruit an hundred fold. The law of natural selection, though not yet formulated, was at work.

The election returns of 1848 tell the story. They are still eloquent. The heart of the movement of that year lay in Massachusetts and Vermont. In those two states, taken together, the party of the future polled, in 1848, a little over 28 per cent. of the aggregate vote cast. In Wisconsin it polled close upon 27 per cent.; and this 27 per cent. in Wisconsin is to be compared with 15 per cent. in Michigan, 12 per cent. in Illinois, less than 11 per cent. in Ohio, and not 4 per cent. in the adjoining state of Iowa. In the three neighboring states of Michigan, Illinois and Iowa, taken together, the new movement gathered into itself 12 per cent. of the total voting constituency, while in Wisconsin it counted, as I have said, over 26 per cent. Thus, in 1848, Wisconsin was the Vermont of the West; sending to Congress as one of its three representatives Charles Durkee, a son of Vermont, the first distinctively anti-slavery man from the Northwest. Wisconsin remained the Vermont of the West. From its very origin not the smallest doubt attached to its attitude. It emphasized it in words when in 1849 it instructed one of its senators at Washington "to immediately resign his seat" because he had "outraged the feelings of the people" by dalliance with the demands of the slave power; it emphasized it by action when five years later its highest judicial tribunal did not hesitate to declare the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 "unconstitutional and void." At the momentous election of 1860, Wisconsin threw 56 per cent. of its vote in favor of the ticket bearing the name of Abraham Lincoln; nor did the convictions of the state weaken under the test of war. In 1864, when Wisconsin had sent into the field over 90,000 enlisted men to maintain the Union, and to make effective the most extreme doctrine of war powers under the Constitution,—even then, in the fourth year of severest stress, Wisconsin again threw 55 per cent. of its popular vote for the re-election of Lincoln. A year later the struggle ended. Throughout the ordeal Wisconsin never faltered.

Of the record made by Wisconsin in the Civil War, I am not here to speak. That field has been sufficiently covered, and covered by those far better qualified than I to work in it. I will only say, in often quoted words, that none then died more reely or in greater glory than those Wisconsin sent into the field, though then many died, and there was much glory. When figures so speak, comment weakens. Look at the record:—Fifty-seven regiments and thirteen batteries in the field; a death-roll exceeding 12,000; a Wisconsin regiment (2d) first in that roll of honor which tells off the regiments of the Union which suffered most, and two other Wisconsin regiments (7th and 26th), together, fifth; while a brigade made up three-

quarters of Wisconsin battalions shows the heaviest aggregate loss sustained during the war by any similar command, and is hence known in the history of the struggle as the "Iron Brigade." Thirteen Wisconsin regiments participated in Grant's brilliant movement on Vicksburg; five were with Thomas at Chickamauga; seven with Sherman at Mission Ridge; and, finally, eleven marched with him to the sea, while four remained behind to strike with Thomas at Nashville. Thus it may truly be said that wherever, between the 13th of April, 1861, and the 26th of April, 1865, death was reaping its heaviest harvest,—whether in Pennsylvania, in Virginia, in Tennessee, in Mississippi, in Georgia,—at Shiloh, at Corinth, at Antietam, at Gettysburg, in the salient at Spottsylvania, in the death-trap at Petersburg, or in the Peninsula slaughter-pen,—wherever during those awful years the dead lay thickest, there the men from Wisconsin were freely laying down their lives.

It is, however, no part of my present purpose to set forth here your sacrifices in the contest of 1861–65. What I have undertaken to do is to assign to Wisconsin its proper and relative place as a factor in one of the great evolutionary movements of man. As the twig was bent, the tree inclined. The sacrifices of Wisconsin life and treasure between 1861 and 1865 were but the fulfilment of the promise given by Wisconsin in 1848. The state, it is true, at no time during that momentous struggle rose to a position of unchallenged leadership either in the field or the council chamber. Among its representatives it did not number a Lincoln or a Sherman; but it did supply in marked degree that greatest and most necessary of all essentials in every evolutionary crisis, a well-developed and thoroughly distributed popular backbone.

This racial characteristic, also, I take to be the one great essential to the success of our American experiment. In every emergency which arises there is always the cry raised for a strong hand at the helm,—the ship of state is invariably declared to be hopelessly drifting. But it is in just those times of crisis that a widely diffused individuality proves the greatest possible safeguard,—the only reliable public safeguard. It is then with the state as it is with a strong, seaworthy ship manned by a hardy and experienced crew, in no way dependent on the one pilot who may chance to be at the wheel. In any stress of storm, the ship's company will prove equal to the occasion, and somehow provide for its own salvation. Under similar political conditions a community asserts, in the long run, its superiority to the accidents of fortune,—the aberrations due to the influence of individual genius, those winning numbers in the lottery of fate,—and evinces that staying power, which, no less now and

here than in Rome and Great Britain, is the only safe rock of empire. The race thus educated and endowed is the masterful race,—the master of its own destiny, it is master of the destiny of others ; and of that crowning republican quality, Wisconsin, during our period of national trial, showed herself markedly possessed. While individuals were not exceptional, the average was unmistakably high.

And this I hold to be the highest tribute which can be paid to a political community. It implies all else. Unless I greatly err, this characteristic has, in the case of Wisconsin, a profound and scientific significance of the most far-reaching character ; and so I find myself brought back to my text. As I have already more than once said, others are in every way better qualified than I to speak intelligently of the Wisconsin stock,—of the elements which enter into the brain and bone and sinew of the race now holding as its abiding-place and breeding-ground the region lying between Lake Michigan and the waters of the upper Mississippi,—between the state of Illinois on the south and Lake Superior on the north. I speak chiefly from impression, and always subject to correction ; but my understanding is that this region was in the main peopled by men and women representing in their persons what there was of the more enterprising, adventurous and energetic of three of the most thoroughly virile and, withal, moral and intellectual branches of the human family,—I refer to the Anglo-Saxon of New England descent, and to the Teutonic and the Scandinavian families. Tough of fibre and tenacious of principle, the mixed descendants from those races were well calculated to illustrate the operation of a natural law ; and I have quite failed in my purpose if I have not improved this occasion to point out how in the outset of their political life as a community they illustrated the force of Stoughton's utterance and the truth of Darwin's remarkable generalization. By their attitude and action, at once intelligent and decided, they left their imprint on that particular phase of human evolution which then presented itself. They, in so doing, assigned to Wisconsin its special place and work in the great scheme of development, and forecast its mission in the future.

I have propounded an historical theory ; it is for others, better advised, having passed upon it, to confirm or reject.

There are many other topics which might here and now be discussed, perhaps advantageously,—topics closely connected with this edifice and with the occasion,—topics relating to libraries, the accumulation of historical material, and methods of work in connection with it ; but space and time alike forbid. A selection must be

made, and, in making my selection, I go back to the fact that, representing one historical society, I am here at the behest of another historical society; and matters relating to what we call "history" are, therefore, those most germane to the day. Coming, then, here from the East to a point which, in the great future of our American development,—a century, or, perchance, two or three centuries hence,—may not unreasonably look forward to being the seat of other methods and a higher learning, I propose to pass over the more obvious, and, possibly, the more useful, even if more modest, subjects of discussion, and to try my hand at one which, even if it challenges controversy, is indisputably suggestive. I refer to certain of the more marked of those tendencies which characterize the historical work of the day. Having dealt with the sifted grain, I naturally come to speak of those who have told the tale of the sifting. Looking back, from the standpoint of 1900, over the harvested sheaves which stud the fields we have traversed, the retrospect is not to me altogether satisfactory. In fact, taken as a whole, our histories—I speak of those written by the dead only—have not, I submit, so far as we are concerned, fully met the requirements of time and place. Literary masterpieces, scientific treatises, philosophical disquisitions, sometimes one element predominates, sometimes another; but in them all something is wanting. That something I take to be an adequately developed literary sense.

In dealing with this subject, I am well aware my criticism might take a wider range. I need not confine myself to history, inasmuch as, in the matter of literary sense, the shortcomings, or the excesses, rather, of the American writer are manifest. In the Greek, and in the Greek alone, this sense seems to have been instinctive. He revealed it, and he revealed it at once, in poetry, in architecture and in art, as he revealed it in the composition of history. Of Homer we cannot speak; but Herodotus and Phidias died within six years of each other, each a father in his calling. With us Americans that intuitive literary sense, resulting in the perfection of literary form seems not less conspicuous for its absence than it was conspicuous for its presence among the Greeks. In literature the American seems to exist in a medium of stenographers and typewriters, and with a public printer at his beck and call. To such a degree is this the case that the expression I have just used—literary form—has, to many, and those not the least cultured, ceased to carry a meaning. Literary form they take to mean what they know as style; while style is, with them, but another term for word-painting. Accordingly, with altogether too many of our American writers, to be voluminous and verbose is to be great. They would

conquer by force of numbers—the number of words they use. I, the other day, chanced across a curious illustration of this in the diary of my father. Returning from his long residence in England at the time of the Civil War, he attended some ceremonies held in Boston in honor of a public character who had died shortly before. “The eulogy,” he wrote, “was good, but altogether too long. There is in all the American style of composition a tendency to diffuseness, and the repetition of the same ideas, which materially impairs the force of what is said. I see it the more clearly from having been so long out of the atmosphere.”

The failing is national; nor in this respect does the American seem to profit by experience. Take, for instance, the most important of our public documents, the inaugurals of our Presidents. We are a busy people; yet our newly elected Presidents regularly inflict on us small volumes of information, and this, too, notwithstanding the fact that in the long line of inaugural commonplaces but one utterance stands out in memory, and that one the shortest of all,—the immortal second of Lincoln. Our present chief magistrate found himself unable to do justice to the occasion, in his last annual message, in less than eighteen thousand words; and in the Congress to which this message was addressed, two senators, in discussing the “paramount” issue of the day, did so, the one in a speech of sixty-five thousand words, the other in a speech of fifty-five thousand. Webster replied to Hayne in thirty-five thousand; and Webster then did not err on the side of brevity. So in the presidential canvass now in progress. Mr. Bryan accepted his nomination in a comparatively brief speech of nine thousand words; and this speech was followed by a letter of five thousand, covering omissions because of previous brevity. President McKinley, in his turn, then accepted a renomination in a letter of twelve thousand words,—a letter actually terse when compared with his last annual message; but which Mr. Carl Schurz subsequently proceeded to comment on in a vigorous address of fourteen thousand words. Leviathans in language, we Americans need to be Methuselahs in years. It was not always so. The contrast is, indeed, noticeable. Washington’s first inaugural numbered twenty-three hundred words. Including that now in progress, my memory covers fourteen presidential canvasses; and by far the most generally applauded and effective letter of acceptance put forth by any candidate during all those canvasses was that of General Grant in 1868. Including address and signature, it was comprised in exactly two hundred and thirty words. With a brevity truly commendable, even if military, he used one word where his civilian

successor found occasion for fifty-two. As to the opponent of that civilian successor, he sets computation at defiance. Indeed, speaking of Mr. Bryan purely from the historical standpoint, I seriously doubt whether, in all human experience, any man ever before gave utterance to an equal number of words in the same space of time.

Leaving illustration, however, and returning to my theme, I will now say that in the whole long and memorable list of distinctively American literary men,—authors, orators, poets and story-tellers,—I recall but three who seem to me to have been endowed with a sense of form, at once innate and Greek; those three were Daniel Webster, Edgar Allan Poe and Nathaniel Hawthorne. Yet, unless moulded by that instinctive sense of form, nothing can be permanent in literature any more than in sculpture, in painting or in architecture. Not size, nor solidity, nor fidelity of work, nor knowledge of detail will preserve the printed volume any more than they will preserve the canvass or the edifice; and this I hold to be just as true of history as of the oration, the poem or the drama.

Surely, then, our histories need not all, of necessity, be designed for students and scholars exclusively; and yet it is a noteworthy fact that even to-day, after scholars and story-tellers have been steadily at work upon it for nearly a century and a half,—ever since David Hume and Oliver Goldsmith brought forth their classic renderings,—the chief popular knowledge of over three centuries of English history between John Plantagenet (1200) and Elizabeth Tudor (1536) is derived from the pages of Shakespeare. There is also a curious theory now apparently in vogue in our university circles, that, in some inscrutable way, accuracy as to fact and a judicial temperament are inconsistent with a highly developed literary sense. Erudition and fairness are the qualities in vogue, while form and brilliancy are viewed askance. Addressing now an assembly made up, to an unusual extent, of those engaged in the work of instruction in history, I wish to suggest that this marked tendency of the day is in itself a passing fashion, and merely a reactionary movement against the influence of two great literary masters of the last generation,—Macaulay and Carlyle. That the reaction had reason, I would by no means deny; but, like most decided reactions, has it not gone too far? Because men weary of brilliant colors, and mere imitators try to wield the master's brush, it by no means follows that art does not find its highest expression in Titian and Tintoretto, Rembrandt, Claude and Turner. It is the same with history. Profound scholars, patient investigators, men of a judicial turn of mind, subtile philosophers and accurate annalists empty forth upon a patient, because somewhat indifferent, read-

ing public volume after volume ; but the great masters of literary form, in history as in poetry, alone retain their hold. Thucydides, Tacitus and Gibbon are always there, on a level with the eye ; while those of their would-be successors who find themselves unable to tell us what they know, in a way in which we care to hear it, or within limits consistent with human life, are quietly relegated to the oblivion of the topmost shelf.

I fear that I am myself in danger of sinning somewhat flagrantly against the canons I have laid down. Exceeding my allotted space, I am conscious of disregarding any correct rule of form by my attempt at dealing with more subjects than it is possible on one occasion adequately to discuss. None the less I cannot resist the temptation,—I am proving myself an American ; and having gone thus far, I will now go on to the end, even though alone. There are, I hold, three elements which enter into the make-up of the ideal historian, whether him of the past or him of the future ;—these three are learning, judgment and the literary sense. A perfect history, like a perfect poem, must have a beginning, a middle and an end ; and the well proportioned parts should be kept in strict subservience to the whole. The dress, also, should be in keeping with the substance ; and both subordinated to the conception. Attempting no display of erudition, pass the great historical literatures and names in rapid review, and see in how few instances all these canons were observed. And first, the Hebrew. While the Jew certainly was not endowed with the Greek's sense of form in sculpture, in painting or in architecture, in poetry and music he was, and has since been, pre-eminent. His philosophy and his history found their natural expression through his aptitudes. The result illustrates the supreme intellectual power exercised by art. Of learning and judgment there is only pretense ; but imagination and power are there : and, even to this day, the Hebrew historical writings are a distinct literature,—we call them "The Sacred Books." We have passed from under that superstition ; and yet it still holds a traditional sway. The books of Moses are merely a first tentative effort on the road subsequently trodden by Herodotus, Livy and Voltaire ; but their author was so instinct with imagination and such a master of form that to this day his narrative is read and accepted as history by more human beings than are all the other historical works in existence combined in one mass. No scholar or man of reflection now believes that Moses was any more inspired than Homer, Julius Cæsar or Thomas Carlyle ; but the imagination and intellectual force of the man, combined with his instinct for literary form, sufficed to secure for what he wrote a unique mastery only in our day shaken.

The Greek follows hard upon the Jew ; and of the Greek I have already said enough. He had a natural sense of art in all its shapes ; and, when it came to writing history, Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon seemed mere evolutions. Of the three, Thucydides alone combined in perfection the qualities of erudition, judgment and form ; but to the last-named element, their literary form, it is that all three owe their immortality.

It is the same with the Romans—Livy, Sallust, Tacitus. The Roman had not that artistic instinct so noticeable in the Greek. He was, on the contrary, essentially a soldier, a ruler and organizer ; and a literary imitator. Yet now and again even in art he attained a proficiency which challenged his models. Cicero has held his own with Demosthenes ; and Virgil, Horace and Juvenal survive, each through a mastery of form. Tacitus, it is needless to say, is the Latin Thucydides. In him again, five centuries after Thucydides, the three essentials are combined in the highest degree. The orbs of the great historical constellation are wide apart,—the interval that divided Tacitus from Thucydides is the same as that which divided Matthew Paris from Edward Gibbon ;—twice that which divides Shakespeare from Tennyson.

Coming rapidly down to modern times, of the three great languages fruitful in historical work,—the French, English and German,—those writing in the first have alone approached the aptitude for form natural to the Greeks ; but in Gibbon only of those who have, in the three tongues, devoted themselves to historical work, were all the cardinal elements of historical greatness found united in such a degree as to command general assent to his pre-eminence. The Germans are remarkable for erudition, and have won respect for their judgment ; but their disregard of form has been innate,—indicative either of a lack of perception or of contempt.¹ Their work accordingly will hardly prove enduring. The French, from Voltaire down, have evinced a keener perception of form, nor have they been lacking in erudition. Critical and quick to perceive, they have still failed in any one instance to combine the three great attributes each in its highest degree. Accordingly, in the historical firmament they count no star of the first magnitude. Their lights have been meteoric rather than permanent.

In the case of Great Britain it is interesting to follow the familiar

¹ "Not only does a German writer possess, as a rule, a full measure of the patient industry which is required for thinking everything that may be thought about his theme, and knowing what others have thought ; he alone, it seems, when he comes to write a book about it, is imbued with the belief that that book ought necessarily to be a complete compendium of everything that has been so thought, whether by himself or others." *The Athenæum*, September 8, 1900, p. 303.

names, noting the shortcoming of each. The roll scarcely extends beyond the century,—Hume, Robertson and Gibbon constituting the solitary remembered exceptions. Of Gibbon, I have already spoken. He combined in highest degree all the elements of the historian,—in as great a degree as Thucydides or Tacitus. He was an orb of the first order; and it was his misfortune that he was born and wrote before Darwin gave to history unity and a scheme. Hume was a subtle philosopher, and his instinctive mastery of form has alone caused his history to survive. He was not an investigator in the modern sense of the term, nor was he gifted with an intuitive historical instinct. Robertson had fair judgment and a well-developed though in no way remarkable sense of form; but he lacked erudition, and, as compared with Gibbon, for example, was content to accept his knowledge at second hand. Telling his story well, he was never master of his subject.

Coming down to our own century, and speaking only of the dead, a series of familiar names at once suggest themselves,—Mitford, Grote and Thirlwall; Arnold and Merivale; Milman, Lingard, Hallam, Macaulay, Carlyle, Buckle, Froude, Freeman and Green,—naming only the more conspicuous. Mitford was no historian at all; merely an historical pamphleteer. His judgment was inferior to his erudition even, and he had no sense of form. Grote was erudite, but he wrote in accordance with his political affinities, and what is called the spirit of the time and place; and that time and place were not Greece, nor the third and fourth centuries before Christ. He had, moreover, no sense of literary form, for he put what he knew into twelve volumes, when human patience did not suffice for six. Thirlwall was erudite in a way, and a thinker and writer of unquestionable force; but his work on Greece was written to order, and is what is known as a “standard history.” Correct, but devoid of inspiration, it is slightly suggestive of a second-class epic. Arnold is typical of scholarship and insight; his judgment is excellent; but of literary art, so conspicuous in his son, there is no trace. Merivale is scholarly and academic. Milman was hampered by his church training, which fettered his judgment; learned, as learning went in those days, there is in his writings nothing that would attract readers or students of a period later than his own. Lingard was another church historian. A correct writer, he tells England’s story from the point of view of Rome. Hallam is deeply read, and judicial; but the literary sense is conspicuously absent. His volumes are well-nigh unreadable. Freeman is the typical modern historian of the original-material-and-monograph school. He writes irrespective of the readers. Learned beyond

compare, he cumbered the shelves of our libraries with an accumulation of volumes which are not literature.

Of Henry Thomas Buckle and of John Richard Green I will speak together, and with respectful admiration. Both were prematurely cut off, almost in what with historical writers is the period of promise; for, while Green at the time of his death was forty-seven, Buckle was not yet forty-one. What they did, therefore,—and they both did much,—was indicative only of what they might have done. Judged by that,—*ex pede Herculem*,—I hold that they come nearer to the ideal of what a twentieth-century historian should be than any other writers in our modern English tongue. That Buckle was crude, impulsive, hasty in generalization and paradoxical in judgment is not to be gainsaid; but he wrote before Darwin; and, when he published his history, he was but thirty-six. What might he not have become had he been favored with health, and lived to sixty! Very different in organization, he and Green alike possessed in high degree the spirit of investigation and the historical insight, combined with a well-developed literary sense. Men of untiring research, they had the faculty of expression. Artists as well as scholars, they inspired. Their early death was in my judgment an irreparable loss to English historical lore and the best historical treatment.

I come now to Macaulay, Carlyle and Froude, the three literary masters of the century who have dealt with history in the English tongue; and I shall treat of them briefly, and in the inverse order. Froude is redeemed by a sense of literary form; as an historian he was learned, but inaccurate, and his judgment was fatally defective. He was essentially an artist. Carlyle was a poet rather than an historian. A student, with the insight of a seer and a prophet's voice, his judgment was fatally biassed. A wonderful master of form, his writings will endure; but rather as epics in prose than as historical monuments. Macaulay came, in my judgment, nearer than any other English writer of the century to the great historical stature; but he failed to attain it. The cause of his failure is an instructive as well as an interesting study.

Thomas Babington Macaulay is unquestionably the most popular historian that ever wrote. His history, when it appeared, was the literary sensation of the day, and its circulation increased with each succeeding volume. Among historical works, it alone has in its vogue thrown into the shade the most successful novels of the century,—those of Scott, Thackeray and Dickens, *Jane Eyre*, *Robert Elsmere*, and even *Richard Carvel*, the last ephemeral sensation; but, of the three great attributes of the historian, Macaulay was endowed with only one. He was a man of vast erudition; and,

moreover, he was gifted with a phenomenal memory, which seemed to put at his immediate disposal the entire accumulation of his omnivorous reading. His judgment was, however, defective; for he was, from the very ardor of his nature,¹ more or less of a partisan, while the wealth of his imagination and the exuberance of his rhetoric were fatal to his sense of form. He was incomparably the greatest of historical *raconteurs*, but the fascination of the story overcame his sense of proportion, and he was buried under his own riches. For it is a great mistake to suppose, as so many do, that what is called style, no matter how brilliant, or how correct and clear, constitutes in itself literary form; it is a large and indispensable element in literary form, but neither the whole, nor indeed the greatest part of it. The entire scheme, the proportion of the several parts to the whole and to each other, the grouping and the presentation, the background and the accessories constitute literary form; the style of the author is merely the drapery of presentation. Here was where Macaulay failed; and he failed on a point which the average historical writer, and the average historical instructor still more, does not as a rule even take into consideration. Macaulay's general conception of his scheme was so imperfect as to be practically impossible; and this he himself, when too late, sadly recognized. His interest in his subject and the warmth of his imagination swept him away,—they were too strong for his sense of proportion. Take, for instance, two such wonderful bits as his account of the trial of the seven bishops, and his narrative of the siege of Londonderry. They are masterpieces; but they should be monographs. They are in their imagery and detail out of all proportion to any general historical plan. They imply a whole which would be in itself an historical library rather than a history. On the matter of judgment it is not necessary to dwell. Macaulay's work is unquestionably history, and history on a panoramic scale; but the pigments he used are indisputably Whig. Yet his method was instinctively correct. He had his models and his scheme,—he made his preliminary studies,—he saw his subject as a whole, and in its several parts; but he labored under two disadvantages:—in the first place, like Gibbon, he was born and wrote before the discoveries of Darwin had

¹ "It is well to realize that this greatest history of modern times was written by one in whom a distrust in enthusiasm was deeply rooted. This cynicism was not inconsistent with partiality, with definite prepossessions, with a certain spite. The conviction that enthusiasm is inconsistent with intellectual balance was engrained in his mental constitution, and confirmed by study and experience. It might be reasonably maintained that zeal for men or causes is an historian's undoing, and that 'reserve sympathy'—the principle of Thucydides—is the first lesson he has to learn." J. B. Bury, Introduction to his edition (1896) of Gibbon, I. lxxvii.—lxxviii.

given its whole great unity to history ; and, in the second place, he had not thought his plan fully out, subordinating severely to it both his imagination and his rhetoric. Accordingly, so far as literary form was concerned, his history, which in that respect above all should, with his classic training, have been an entire and perfect chrysolite, was in fact a monumental failure. It was not even a whole ; it was only a fragment.

Coming now to our own American experience, and still speaking exclusively of the writings of the dead, it is not unsafe to say that there is as yet no American historical work which can call even for mention among those of the first class. The list can speedily be passed in review,—Marshall, Irving, Prescott, Hildreth, Bancroft, Motley, Palfrey and Parkman. Except those yet living, I do not recall any others who would challenge consideration. That Marshall was endowed with a calm, clear judgment, no reader of his judicial opinions would deny ; but he had no other attribute of an historian. He certainly was not historically learned, and there is no evidence that he was gifted with any sense of literary proportion. Irving was a born man of letters. With a charming style and a keen sense of humor, he was as an historical writer defective in judgment. Not a profound or accurate investigator, as became apparent in his *Columbus* and his *Washington*, his excellent natural literary sense was but partially developed. Perhaps he was born before his time ; perhaps his education did not lead him to the study of the best models ; but, however it came about, he failed, and failed indisputably, in form. Prescott was a species of historical pioneer,—an adventurer in a new field of research and of letters. Not only was he, like Macaulay and the rest, born before Darwin and the other great scientific lights of the century had assigned to human history its unity, limits and significance, but Prescott was not a profound scholar, nor yet a thorough investigator ; his judgment was by no means either incisive or robust, and his style was elegant, as the phrase goes, rather than tersely vigorous. He wrote, moreover, of that which he never saw, or made himself thoroughly part of even in imagination. Laboring under great disadvantages, his course was infinitely creditable ; but his portrait in the gallery of historians is not on the eye line. Of Hildreth, it is hardly necessary to speak. Laborious and persevering, his investigation was not thorough ; indeed he had not taken in the fundamental conditions of modern historical research. With a fatally defective judgment, he did not know what form was.

George Bancroft was in certain ways unique, and, among writers and students, his name cannot be mentioned without respect. He

was by nature an investigator. His learning and philosophy cannot be called sound, and his earlier manner was something to be forever avoided: but he was indefatigable as a collector, and his patience knew no bounds. He devoted his life to his subject; and his life came to a close while he was still dwelling on the preliminaries to his theme. A partisan, and writing in support of a preconceived theory, his judgment was necessarily biassed; while, as respects literary form, though he always tended to what was better, he never even approximately reached what is best. He, too, like Macaulay, failed to grasp the wide and fundamental distinction between a proportioned and complete history and a thorough historical monograph. His monumental work, therefore, is neither the one nor the other. As a collection of monographs, it is too condensed and imperfect; as a history, it is cumbersome, and enters into unnecessary detail.

From a literary point of view Motley is unquestionably the most brilliant of American historical writers. He reminds the reader of Froude. Not naturally a patient or profound investigator, he yet forced himself to make a thorough study of his great subject, and he was gifted with a remarkable descriptive power. A man of intense personality, he was, however, defective in judgment, if not devoid of the faculty. He lacked calmness and method. He could describe a siege or a battle with a vividness which, while it revealed the master, revealed also the historian's limitations. With a distinct sense of literary form, he was unable to resist the temptations of imagination and sympathy. His taste was not severe; his temper the reverse of serene. His defects as an historian were consequently as apparent as are his merits as a writer.

Of Palfrey, the historian, I would speak with the deep personal respect I entertained for the man. A typical New Englander, a victim almost of that "terrible New England conscience," he wrote the history of New England. A scholar in his way and the most patient of investigators, he had, as an historian, been brought up in a radically wrong school, that of New England theology. There was in him not a trace of the skeptic; not a suggestion of the humorist or easy-going philosopher. He wrote of New England from the inside and in close sympathy with it. Thus, as respects learning, care and accuracy, he was in no way deficient, while he was painstaking and conscientious in the extreme. His training and mental characteristics, however, impaired his judgment, and he was quite devoid of any sense of form. The investigator will always have recourse to his work; but, as a guide, its value will pass

away with the traditions of the New England theological period. From the literary point of view the absence of all idea of proportion renders the bulk of what he wrote impossible for the reader.

Of those I have mentioned, Parkman alone remains ; perhaps the most individual of all our American historians, the one tasting most racily of the soil. Parkman did what Prescott failed to do, what it was not in Prescott ever to do. He wrote from the basis of a personal knowledge of the localities in which what he had to narrate occurred, and the characteristics of those with whom he undertook to deal. To his theme he devoted his entire life, working under difficulties even greater than those which so cruelly hampered Prescott. His patience under suffering was infinite ; his research was indefatigable. In this respect, he left nothing to be desired. While his historical judgment was better than his literary taste, his appreciation of form was radically defective. Indeed he seemed almost devoid of any true sense of proportion. The result is that he has left behind him a succession of monographs of more or less historical value or literary interest, but no complete, thoroughly designed and carefully proportioned historical unit. Like all the others, his work lacks form and finish.

The historical writers of more than an hundred years have thus been passed in hasty review, nor has any nineteenth-century compeer of Thucydides, Tacitus and Gibbon been found among those who have expressed themselves in the English tongue. Nor do I think that any such could be found in other tongues ; unless, perchance, among the Germans, Theodor Mommsen might challenge consideration. Of Mommsen's learning there can be no question. I do not think there can be much of his insight and judgment. The sole question would be as to his literary form ; nor, in that respect, judging by the recollection of thirty years, do I think that, so far as his history of Rome is concerned, judgment can be lightly passed against him. But, on this point, the verdict of time only is final. Before that verdict is in his case rendered, another half-century of probation must elapse.¹

¹ "C'est sous ces deux aspects—qui sont en réalité les deux faces de l'esprit de Mommsen, le savant et le politique—qu'il convient d'étudier cet ouvrage.

"Dans l'exposé scientifique de l'*Histoire Romaine* on ne sait ce qu'on doit le plus admirer, ou de la science colossale de l'auteur ou de l'art avec laquelle elle est mise en œuvre.

"C'était une entreprise colossale que celle de résumer tous les travaux sur la matière depuis Niebuhr. Mommsen lui-même avait contribué à ce travail par la quantité fabuleuse de mémoires qu'il avait écrits sur les points les plus spéciaux du droit romain, de l'archéologie ou de l'histoire. Or tout cela est assimilé d'une manière merveilleuse dans une narration historique qui est un des chefs-d'œuvre de l'historiographie. L'*histoire romaine* est une œuvre extraordinaire dans sa condensation, comme il n'en existe nulle

There is still something to be taken into consideration. I have as yet dealt only with the writers ; the readers remain. During the century now ending, what changes have here come about ? For one, I frankly confess myself a strong advocate of what is sometimes rather contemptuously referred to as the popularization of history. I have but a limited sympathy with those who, from the etherealized atmosphere of the cloister, whether monkish or collegiate, seek truth's essence and pure learning only, regardless of utility, of sympathy or of applause. The great historical writer, fully to accomplish his mission, must, I hold, be in very close touch with the generation he addresses. In other words, to do its most useful work, historical thought must be made to permeate what we are pleased to call the mass ; it must be infiltrated through that great body of the community which, moving slowly and subject to all sorts of influences, in the end shapes national destinies. The true historian,—he who most sympathetically, as well as correctly, reads to the present the lessons to be derived from the experience of the past,—I hold to be the only latter-day prophet. That man has a message to deliver ; but, to deliver it effectively, he must, like every successful preacher, understand his audience ; and, to understand it, he must either be instinctively in sympathy with it, or he must have made a study of it. Of those instinctively in sympathy, I do not speak. That constitutes genius, and genius is a law unto itself ; but I do maintain that instructors in history and historical writers who ignore the prevailing literary and educational conditions, therein make a great mistake. He fails fatally who fails to conform to his environment ; and this is no less true of the historian than of the novelist or politician.

In other words, what have we to say of those who read ? What do we know of them ? Not much, I fancy. In spite of our public libraries, and in spite of the immensely increased diffusion of printed

autre au monde, enfermant dans des dimensions si restreintes (3 volumes in 8°) tant de choses et de si bonnes choses. Mommsen raconte d'une manière si attrayante que dès les premières lignes vous êtes entraîné. Ses grands tableaux sur les premières migrations des peuples en Italie, sur les débuts de Rome, sur les Etrusques, sur la domination des Hellènes en Italie ; ses chapitres sur les institutions romaines, le droit, la religion, l'armée et l'art ; sur la vie économique, l'agriculture, l'industrie et le commerce ; sur le développement intérieur de la politique romaine ; sur les Celtes et sur Carthage ; sur les péripéties de la Révolution romaine depuis les Gracques à Jules César ; sur l'Orient grec, la Macédoine ; sur la soumission de la Gaule : tout cela forme un ensemble admirable.

“ Comme peintre de grands tableaux historiques, je ne vois parmi les historiens contemporains qu'un homme qui puisse être comparé à Mommsen, c'est Ernest Renan : c'est la même touche large, le même sens des proportions, le même art de faire voir et de faire comprendre, de rendre vivantes les choses par les détails typiques qui se gravent pour toujours dans la mémoire.” Guillard, *L'Allemagne Nouvelle et ses Historiens* (1900), pp. 121-122.

matter through the agency of those libraries and of the press, what those who compose the great mass of the community are reading, what enters into their intellectual nutriment, and thence passes into the secretions of the body politic,—this, I imagine, is a subject chiefly of surmise. The field is one upon which I do not now propose to enter. Too large, it is also a pathless wilderness. I would, however, earnestly commend it to some more competent treatment at an early convention of librarians or publishers. To-day we must confine ourselves to history. For what, in the way of history, is the demand? Who are at present the popular historical writers? How can the lessons of the past be most readily and most effectually brought home to the mind and thoughts of the great reading public, vastly greater and more intelligent now than ever before?

This is something upon which the census throws no light. There is a widespread impression among those more or less qualified to form an opinion that the general capacity for sustained reading and thinking has not increased or been strengthened with the passage of the years. On the contrary, the indications, it is currently supposed, are rather of emasculation. Everything must now be made easy and short. There is a constant demand felt, especially by our periodical press, for information on all sorts of subjects,—historical, philosophical, scientific,—but it must be set forth in what is known as a popular style, that is, introduced into the reader in a species of sugared capsule, and without leaving any annoying taste on the intellectual palate. The average reader, it is said, wants to know something concerning all the topics of the day; but, while it is highly desirable he should be gratified in this laudable, though languid, craving, he must not be fatigued in the effort of acquisition, and he will not submit to be bored. It is then further argued that this was not the case formerly; that in what are commonly alluded to as “the good old times,”—always the times of the grandparents,—people had fewer books, and fewer people read; but those who did read, deterred neither by number of pages nor by dryness of treatment, were equal to the feat of reading. To-day, on the contrary, almost no one rises to more than a magazine article; a volume appalls.

This is an extremely interesting subject of inquiry, were the real facts only attainable. Unfortunately they are not. We are forced to deal with impressions; and impressions, always vague, are usually deceptive. At the same time, when glimpses of a more or less remote past do now and again reach us, they seem to indicate mental conditions calculated to excite our special wonder. We do know, for instance, that in the olden days,—before public libraries and peri-

odicals, and the modern cheap press and the Sunday newspaper were devised,—when books were rarities, and reading a somewhat rare accomplishment,—the Bible, Shakespeare, *Paradise Lost*, the *Pilgrim's Progress*, and *Robinson Crusoe*, the *Spectator* and *Tatler*, Barrow's *Sermons* and Hume's *History of England* were the standard household and family literature; and the Bible was read and reread until its slightest allusions passed into familiar speech. Indeed the Bible, in King James's version, may be said to have been for the great mass of the community,—those who now have recourse to the Sunday paper,—the sum and substance of English literature. In this respect it is fairly open to question whether the course of evolution has tended altogether toward improvement. Now and again, however, we get one of these retrospective glimpses which is simply bewildering, and while indulging in it, one cannot help pondering over the mental conditions which once apparently prevailed. The question suggests itself, were there giants in those days?—or did the reader ask for bread, and did they give him a stone? We know, for instance, what the public library and circulating library of to-day are. We know, to a certain extent, what the reading demand is, and who the popular authors are. We know that, while history must content itself with a poor one in twenty, the call for works of fiction is more than a third of the whole, while nearly eighty per cent. of the ordinary circulation is made up of novels, story books for children, and periodicals. It is the lightest form of pabulum. This, in 1900. Now, let us get a glimpse of "the good old times."

In the year 1790, a humorous rascal named Burroughs—once widely known as "the notorious Stephen Burroughs"—found himself stranded in a town on Long Island, New York, a refugee from a Massachusetts gaol and whipping-post, the penalties incurred in or at both of which he had richly merited. In the place of his refuge, Burroughs served as the village schoolmaster; and, being of an observant turn of mind, he did not fail presently to note that the people of the place were "very illiterate," and almost entirely destitute of books of any kind, "except school books and bibles." Finding among the younger people of the community many "possessing bright abilities and a strong thirst for information," Burroughs asserts that he bestirred himself to secure the funds necessary to found the nucleus of a public library. Having in a measure succeeded, a meeting of "the proprietors" was called "for the purpose of selecting a catalogue of books;" and presently the different members presented lists "peculiar to their own tastes." Prior to this meeting it had been alleged that the people generally anticipated

that the books would be selected by the clergyman of the church, and would "consist of books of divinity, and dry metaphysical writings ; whereas, should they be assured that histories and books of information would be procured," they would have felt very differently. And now, when the lists were submitted, "Deacon Hodges brought forward 'Essays on the Divine Authority for Infant Baptism,' 'Terms of Church Communion,' 'The Careful Watchman,' 'Age of Grace,' etc. ; Deacon Cook's collection was 'History of Martyrs,' 'Rights of Conscience,' 'Modern Pharisees,' 'Defence of Separates ;' Mr. Woolworth exhibited 'Edwards against Chauncy,' 'History of Redemption,' 'Jennings's Views,' etc. ; Judge Hurlbut concurred in the same ; Dr. Rose exhibited 'Gay's Fables,' 'Pleasing Companion,' 'Turkish Spy,' while I," wrote Burroughs, "for the third time recommended 'Hume's History,' 'Voltaire's Histories,' 'Rollin's Ancient History,' 'Plutarch's Lives,' etc."

It would be difficult to mark more strikingly the development of a century, than by thus presenting Hume's History and Rollin as typical of what was deemed light and popular reading at one end of it, and the Sunday newspaper at the other. As I have already intimated, they were either giants in those days, or husks supplied milk for babes. Recurring, however, to present conditions, the popular demand for historical literature is undoubtedly vastly larger than it was a century ago ; nor is it by any means so clear as is usually assumed that the solid reading and thinking power of the community has at all deteriorated. That yet remains to be proved. A century ago, it is to be borne in mind, there were no public libraries at all, and the private collections of books were comparatively few and small. It is safe, probably, to assume that there are a hundred, or even a thousand, readers now to one then. On this head nothing even approximating to what would be deemed conclusive evidence is attainable ; but the fair assumption is that, while the light and ephemeral, knowledge-made-easy reading is a development of these latter years, it has in no way displaced the more sustained reading and severe thought of the earlier time. On the contrary, that also has had its share of increase. Take Gibbon, for instance. A few years ago, an acute and popular English critic, in speaking of the newly edited *Memoirs* of Gibbon, used this language :—"All readers of the *Decline and Fall*—that is to say, all men and women of a sound education," etc. If Mr. Frederic Harrison was correct in his generalization in 1896, certainly more could not have been said in 1796 ; and, during the intervening hundred years, the class of those who have received "a sound educa-

tion " has undergone a prodigious increase. Take Harvard College, for instance ; in 1796 it graduated thirty-three students, and in 1896 it graduated four hundred and eight,—an increase of more than twelvefold. In 1796, also, there were not a tenth part of the institutions of advanced education in the country which now exist. The statistics of the publishing houses and the shelves of the book-selling establishments all point to the same conclusion. Of course, it does not follow that because a book is bought it is also read ; but it is not unsafe to say that twenty copies of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* are called for in the bookstores of to-day to one that was called for in 1800.

On this subject, however, very instructive light may be derived from another quarter. I refer to the public library. While discussing the question eighteen months ago, I ventured to state that, " in the case of one public library in a considerable Massachusetts city I had been led to conclude, as the result of examination and somewhat careful inquiry, that the copy of the *Decline and Fall* on its shelves had, in over thirty years, not once been consecutively read through by a single individual." I have since made further and more careful inquiry on this point from other, and larger, though similar institutions, and the inference I then drew has been confirmed and generalized. I have also sought information as to the demand for historical literature, and the tendency and character of the reading so far as it could be ascertained, or approximately inferred. I have submitted my list of historical writers, and inquired as to the call for them. Suggestive in all respects, the results have, in some, been little less than startling. Take for instance popularity, and let me recur to Macaulay and Carlyle. I have spoken of the two as great masters in historical composition,—comparing them in their field to Turner and Millet in the field of art. Like Turner and Millet, they influenced to a marked extent a whole generation of workers that ensued. To such an extent did they influence it that a scholastic reaction against them set in,—a reaction as distinct as it was strong. Nevertheless, in spite of that reaction, to what extent did the master retain his popular hold ? I admit that my astonishment was great when I learned that between 1880, more than twenty years after his death, and 1900, besides innumerable editions issued on both sides of the Atlantic, the authorized London publishers of Macaulay had sold in two shapes only,—and they appear in many other shapes,—80,000 copies of his *History* and 90,000 of his *Miscellanies*. Of Carlyle and the call for his writings I could gather no such specific particulars ; but in reply to my inquiries, I was generally advised that, while the English demand had been large,

•

there was no considerable American publishing house which had not brought out partial or complete editions of his works. They also were referred to as "innumerable."¹ In other words, when a generation that knew them not had passed away, the works of the two great masters of historical literary form in our day sold beyond all compare with the productions of any of the living writers most in vogue; and this while the professorial dry-as-dust reaction against those masters was in fullest swing.

With a vast amount of material unused, and much still unsaid, I propose, in concluding, to trespass still further on your patience while I draw a lesson to which the first portion of my discourse will contribute not less than the second. A great, as well as a very voluminous, recent historical writer has coined the apothegm,—“History is past politics, and politics are present History.” The proposition is one I do not now propose to discuss, except to suggest that, however it may have been heretofore, what is known as politics will be but a part, and by no means the most important part, of the history of the future. The historian will look deeper. It was President Lincoln who said in one of the few immortal utterances of the century,—an utterance, be it also observed, limited to two hundred and fifty words,—that this our nation was “conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal;” and that it was for us highly to resolve “that government of the people, by the people, for the people, should not perish from the earth.” It was James Russell Lowell, who, when asked in Paris by the historian Guizot many years since, how long the Republic of the United States might reasonably be expected to endure, happily replied,—“So long as the ideas of its founders continue dominant.” In the first place, I hold it not unsafe to say that, looking forward into a future not now remote, the mission of the Republic and the ideas of the founders will more especially rest in the hands of those agricultural communities of the Northwest, where great aggregations of a civic populace are few, and the principles of natural selection have had the fullest and the freest play in the formation of the race. Such is Wisconsin; such Iowa; such Minnesota. In their hands, and in the hands of communities like them, will rest the ark of our covenant.

¹ At least twenty (20) American publishing houses have brought out complete editions of Macaulay, both his *Miscellanies* and the *History of England*. Many of these editions have been expensive, and they seem uniformly to have met with a ready demand. Almost every American publishing house of any note has brought out editions of some of the *Essays*. The same is, to a less extent, true of Carlyle. Seven (7) houses have brought out complete editions of his works; while three (3) others have put on the market imported editions, bearing an American imprint. Separate editions of the more popular of his writings—some cheap, others *de luxe*—have been brought out by nearly every American publishing concern.

In the next place, for the use and future behoof of those communities I hold that the careful and intelligent reading of the historical lessons of the past is all important. Without that reading, and a constant emphasis laid upon its lessons, the nature of that mission and those ideas to which Lincoln and Lowell alluded cannot be kept fresh in mind. This institution I accordingly regard as the most precious of all Wisconsin's endowments of education. It should be the sheet-anchor by which, amid the storms and turbulence of a tempestuous future, the ship of state will be anchored to the firm holding-ground of tradition. It is to further this result that I to-day make appeal to the historian of the future. His, in this community, is a great and important mission ; a mission which he will not fulfil unless he to a large extent frees himself from the trammels of the past, and rises to an equality with the occasion. He must be a prophet and a poet, as well as an investigator and an annalist. He must cut loose from many of the models and most of the precedents of the immediate past, and the educational precepts now so commonly in vogue. He must perplex the modern college professor by asserting that soundness is not always and of necessity dull, and that even intellectual sobriety may be carried to an excess. Not only is it possible for a writer to combine learning and accuracy with vivacity, but to be read and to be popular should not in the eyes of the judicious be a species of stigma. Historical research may, on the other hand, result in a mere lumber of learning ; and, even in the portrayal of the sequence of events, it is to a man's credit that he should strive to see things from the point of view of an artist, rather than, looking with the dull eye of a mechanic, seek to measure them with the mechanic's twelve-inch rule. I confess myself weary of those reactionary influences amid which of late we have lived. I distinctly look back with regret to that more spiritual and more confident time when we of the generation now passing from the stage drew our inspiration from prophets, and not from laboratories. So to-day I make bold to maintain that the greatest benefactor America could have—far more immediately influential than any possible President or senator or peripatetic political practitioner, as well as infinitely more so in a remote future—would be some historical writer, occupying perhaps a chair here at Madison, who would in speech and book explain and expound, as they could be explained and expounded, the lessons of American history and the fundamental principles of American historical faith.

It was Macaulay who made his boast that, disregarding the traditions which constituted what he contemptuously termed "the dig-

nity of history," he would set forth England's story in so attractive a form that his volumes should displace the last novel from the work-table of the London society girl. And he did it. It is but the other day that an American naval officer suddenly appeared in the field of historical literature, and, by two volumes, sensibly modified the policy of nations. Here are precept and example. To accomplish similar results should, I hold, be the ambition of the American historian. Popularity he should court as a necessary means to an end; and that he should attain popularity, he must study the art of presentation as much and as thoughtfully as he delves amid the original material of history. Becoming more of an artist, rhetorician and philosopher than he now is, he must be less of a pedant and colorless investigator. In a word, going back to Moses, Thucydides and Herodotus; Tacitus, Gibbon and Voltaire; Niebuhr, Macaulay, Carlyle, Buckle, Green, Mommsen and Froude, he must study their systems, and, avoiding the mistakes into which they fell, thoughtfully accommodating himself to the conditions of the present, he must prepare to fulfil the mission before him. He will then in time devise what is so greatly needed for our political life, the distinctively American historical method of the future. Of this we have as yet had hardly the promise, and that only recently through the pages of Fiske and Mahan; and I cannot help surmising that it is to some Eastern seed planted here in the freer environment of the more fruitful West that we must look for its ultimate realization.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

APPENDIX.

THE full record of J. Q. Adams's utterances on this most important subject has never been made up. (See *Works of Charles Sumner*, VI. 19-23, VII. 142.) Historically speaking, it is of exceptional significance: and, accordingly, for convenience of reference, a partial record is here presented.

In 1836 Mr. Adams represented in Congress what was then the Massachusetts "Plymouth" district. In April of that year the issue, which, just twenty-five years later, was to result in overt civil war, was fast assuming shape; for on the 21st of the month, the battle of San Jacinto was fought, resulting immediately in the independence of Texas, and more remotely in its annexation to the United States and the consequent war of spoliation (1846-48) with Mexico. At the same time petitions in great number were pouring into Congress from the Northern states asking for the abolition of slavery, and the prohibition of the domestic slave-trade in the District of Columbia; the admission into the Union of Arkansas, with a constitution recognizing slavery, was also under consideration. In the course of a long personal letter dated April 4, 1836, written

to the Hon. Solomon Lincoln, of Hingham, a prominent constituent of his, Mr. Adams made the following incidental reference to the whole subject, indicative of the degree to which the question of martial law as a possible factor in the solution of the problem then occupied his mind :

“The new pretensions of the Slave representation in Congress, of a right to refuse to receive Petitions, and that Congress have no Constitutional power to abolish slavery or the slave trade in the District of Columbia forced upon me so much of the discussion as I did take upon me, but in which you are well aware I did not and could not speak a tenth part of my mind. I did not, for example, start the question whether by the Law of God and of Nature man can hold property, hereditary property in man—I did not start the question whether in the event of a servile insurrection and War, Congress would not have complete, unlimited control over the whole subject of slavery even to the emancipation of all the slaves in the State where such insurrection should break out, and for the suppression of which the freemen in Plymouth and Norfolk Counties, Massachusetts, should be called by Acts of Congress to pour out their treasures and to shed their blood. Had I spoken my mind on those two points the sturdiest of the abolitionists would have disavowed the sentiments of their champion.”

A little more than seven weeks after thus writing, Mr. Adams made the following entries in his diary :

May 25th. “At the House, the motion of Robertson, to recommit Pinckney’s slavery report, with instructions to report a resolution declaring that Congress has no constitutional authority to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, as an amendment to the motion for printing an extra number of the report, was first considered. Robertson finished his speech, which was vehement. . . .

“Immediately after the conclusion of Robertson’s speech I addressed the Speaker, but he gave the floor to Owens, of Georgia, one of the signing members of the committee, who moved the previous question, and refused to withdraw it. It was seconded and carried, by yeas and nays. . . .

“The hour of one came, and the order of the day was called—a joint resolution from the Senate, authorizing the President to cause rations to be furnished to suffering fugitives from Indian hostilities in Alabama and Georgia. Committee of the whole on the Union, and a debate of five hours, in which I made a speech of about an hour, wherein I opened the whole subject of the Mexican, Indian, negro, and English war.”

It was in the course of this speech that Mr. Adams first enunciated the principle of emancipation through martial law, exercised under the Constitution in time of war. He did so in the following passage :

“Mr. Chairman, are you ready for all these wars? A Mexican war? A war with Great Britain if not with France? A general Indian war? A servile war? And, as an inevitable consequence of them all, a civil war? For it must ultimately terminate in a war of colors as well as of races. And do you imagine that, while with your eyes open you are wilfully kindling, and then closing your eyes and blindly rushing into them ; do you imagine that while in the very nature of things, your own

Southern and Southwestern States must be the Flanders of these complicated wars, the battlefield on which the last great battle must be fought between slavery and emancipation ; do you imagine that your Congress will have no constitutional authority to interfere with the institution of slavery *in any way* in the States of this Confederacy? Sir, they must and will interfere with it—perhaps to sustain it by war ; perhaps to abolish it by treaties of peace ; and they will not only possess the constitutional power so to interfere, but they will be bound in duty to do it by the express provisions of the Constitution itself. From the instant that your slaveholding States become the theatre of war, civil, servile or foreign, from that instant the war powers of Congress extend to interference with the institution of slavery in every way in which it can be interfered with, from a claim of indemnity for slaves taken or destroyed, to the cession of the State burdened with slavery to a foreign power.”

The following references to this speech are then found in the diary :

May 29th.—“ I was occupied all the leisure of the day and evening in writing out for publication my speech made last Wednesday in the House of Representatives—one of the most hazardous that I ever made, and the reception of which, even by the people of my own district and State, is altogether uncertain.”

June 2d.—“ My speech on the distribution of rations to the fugitives from Indian hostilities in Alabama and Georgia was published in the National Intelligencer of this morning, and a subscription paper was circulated in the House for printing it in a pamphlet, for which Gales told me there were twenty-five hundred copies ordered. Several members of the House of both parties spoke of it to me, some with strong dissent.”

June 19th.—“ My speech on the rations comes back with echoes of thundering vituperation from the South and West, and with one universal shout of applause from the North and East. This is a cause upon which I am entering at the last stage of life, and with the certainty that I cannot advance in it far ; my career must close, leaving the cause at the threshold. To open the way for others is all that I can do. The cause is good and great.”

So far as the record goes, the doctrine was not again propounded by Mr. Adams until 1841. On the 7th of June of that year he made a speech in the House of Representatives in support of a motion for the repeal of the Twenty-first Rule of the House, commonly known as “ the Atherton Gag.” Of this speech, no report exists ; but in the course of it he again enunciated the martial law theory of emancipation. The next day he was followed in debate by C. J. Ingersoll, of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who took occasion to declare that what he had heard the day previous had made his “ blood curdle with horror.”

“ Mr. Adams here rose in explanation, and said he did not say that in the event of a servile war or insurrection of slaves, the Constitution of the United States would be at an end. What he did say was this, that in the event of a servile war or insurrection of slaves, if the people of the free States were called upon to suppress the insurrection, and to spend their blood and treasure in putting an end to the war—a war in which the distinguished Virginian, the author of the Declaration of Independence, had said that ‘ God has no attribute in favor of the master ’—

then he would not say that Congress might not interfere with the institution of slavery in the States, and that, through the *treaty-making power*, universal emancipation might not be the result."

The following year the contention was again discussed in the course of the memorable debate on the "Haverhill Petition." Mr. Adams was then bitterly assailed by Henry A. Wise, of Virginia, and Thomas F. Marshall, of Kentucky. Mr. Adams at the time did not reply to them on this head; but, on the 14th of the following April, occasion offered, and he then once more laid down the law on the subject, as he understood it, and as it was subsequently put in force:—

"I would leave that institution to the exclusive consideration and management of the States more peculiarly interested in it, just as long as they can keep within their own bounds. So far I admit that Congress has no power to meddle with it. As long as they do not step out of their own bounds, and do not put the question to the people of the United States, whose peace, welfare, and happiness are all at stake, so long I will agree to leave them to themselves. But when a member from a free State brings forward certain resolutions, for which, instead of reasoning to disprove his positions, you vote a censure upon him, and that without hearing, it is quite another affair. At the time this was done I said that, as far as I could understand the resolutions proposed by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Giddings), there were some of them for which I was ready to vote, and some which I must vote against; and I will now tell this House, my constituents, and the world of mankind, that the resolution against which I should have voted was that in which he declares that what are called the slave States have the exclusive right of consultation on the subject of slavery. For that resolution I never would vote, because I believe that it is not just, and does not contain constitutional doctrine. I believe that so long as the slave States are able to sustain their institutions without going abroad or calling upon other parts of the Union to aid them or act on the subject, so long I will consent never to interfere.

"I have said this, and I repeat it; but if they come to the free States and say to them you must help us to keep down our slaves, you must aid us in an insurrection and a civil war, then I say that with that call comes a full and plenary power to this House and to the Senate over the whole subject. It is a war power. I say it is a war power, and when your country is actually in war, whether it be a war of invasion or a war of insurrection, Congress has power to carry on the war, and must carry it on according to the laws of war; and by the laws of war an invaded country has all its laws and municipal institutions swept by the board, and martial law takes the place of them. This power in Congress has, perhaps, never been called into exercise under the present Constitution of the United States. But when the laws of war are in force, what, I ask, is one of those laws? It is this: that when a country is invaded, and two hostile armies are set in martial array, the commanders of both armies have power to emancipate all the slaves in the invaded territory. Nor is this a mere theoretic statement. The history of South America shows that the doctrine has been carried into practical execution within the last thirty years. Slavery was abolished in Colombia, first, by the Spanish General, Morillo, and, secondly, by the American General, Bolivar. It was abolished by virtue of a military command given at the

head of the army, and its abolition continues to be law to this day. It was abolished by the laws of war, and not by municipal enactments; the power was exercised by military commanders under instructions, of course, from their respective Governments. And here I recur again to the example of General Jackson. What are you now about in Congress? You are passing a grant to refund to General Jackson the amount of a certain fine imposed upon him by a Judge under the laws of the State of Louisiana. You are going to refund him the money, with interest; and this you are going to do because the imposition of the fine was unjust. And why was it unjust? Because General Jackson was acting under the laws of war, and because the moment you place a military commander in a district which is the theatre of war, the laws of war apply to that district. . . .

"I might furnish a thousand proofs to show that the pretensions of gentlemen to the sanctity of their municipal institutions under a state of actual invasion and of actual war, whether servile, civil, or foreign, is wholly unfounded, and that the laws of war do, in all such cases, take the precedence. I lay this down as the law of nations. I say that the military authority takes for the time the place of all municipal institutions, and slavery among the rest; and that, under that state of things, so far from its being true that the States where slavery exists have the exclusive management of the subject, not only the President of the United States but the commander of the army has power to order the universal emancipation of the slaves. I have given here more in detail a principle which I have asserted on this floor before now, and of which I have no more doubt, than that you, Sir, occupy that Chair. I give it in its development, in order that any gentleman from any part of the Union may, if he thinks proper, deny the truth of the position, and may maintain his denial; not by indignation, not by passion and fury, but by sound and sober reasoning from the laws of nations and the laws of war. And if my position can be answered and refuted, I shall receive the refutation with pleasure; I shall be glad to listen to reason, aside, as I say, from indignation and passion. And if by the force of reasoning my understanding can be convinced, I here pledge myself to recant what I have asserted.

"Let my position be answered; let me be told, let my constituents be told, the people of my State be told,—a State whose soil tolerates not the foot of a slave,—that they are bound by the Constitution to a long and toilsome march under burning summer suns and a deadly Southern clime for the suppression of a servile war; that they are bound to leave their bodies to rot upon the sands of Carolina, to leave their wives and their children orphans; that those who cannot march are bound to pour out their treasures while their sons or brothers are pouring out their blood to suppress a servile, combined with a civil or a foreign war, and yet there exists no power beyond the limits of the slave State where such war is raging to emancipate the slaves. I say, let this be proved—I am open to conviction; but until that conviction comes I put it forth not as a dictate of feeling, but as a settled maxim of the laws of nations, that in such a case the military supersedes the civil power."

The only comment on this utterance made by Mr. Adams in his diary was the following:—"My speech on this day stung the slaveocracy to madness."

Here the proposition rested until 1861, when the course of events brought into forcible application the principles abstractly enunciated twenty years before by Mr. Adams.

MIRABEAU'S SECRET MISSION TO BERLIN¹

ONE of the most sensational and damaging books ever published for the sins of a feeble and foolish government and the delectation of a scandal-loving public was Mirabeau's *Secret History of the Court of Berlin*. The unanimous outcry that greeted its appearance is not difficult to understand. Prince Henry of Prussia, brother of the illustrious Frederick, was at the time the guest of the French court, and here was a semi-official agent of that court informing the world that the Prince was narrow, vain, incapable and ridiculous; the peril of a war with the most military power of Europe had but recently been avoided, and here were thrown to the public quasi-diplomatic reports to the French government showing up the ruler of the Prussian monarchy as a "king of weaklings," as a feeble-minded, self-opinionated, boorish monarch, whom profligacy and conceit alone swayed. In these able, trenchant and witty pages, the surroundings of the Prussian court were unmercifully painted in lurid and scandalous colors, as they had originally been depicted in the dispatches sent from Berlin by Mirabeau for the information and amusement of the advisers of Louis XVI., perhaps for that of the King himself. The fate of the book was clearly written and easy to forecast. Versailles made hurried apologies to Potsdam, the author bowed before the storm and brazenly denied all paternity, and the hangman, on an order of the Parliament of Paris, consigned it in due form to the flames; all of which matters in no way prevented the reading of the book by all who could procure a copy.

Between the publication of the original edition by Malassis at Alençon in 1789 and of the latest one, now under review, various reprints have appeared, of which Mr. Welschinger, the present editor, purports to give a complete list; his attention may be directed to at least two which he has failed to notice: one by Blasdon (Paternoster Row, 1789), the other by P. Byrne (Dublin), of the same date.

The present edition does great credit to the indefatigable French historian, and it must be said at the earliest possible moment that Mr. Welschinger appears at his best when treating a subject that

¹ *La Mission Secrète de Mirabeau à Berlin, 1786-1787*; d'après les documents originaux des Archives des Affaires Étrangères, avec introduction et notes par Henri Welschinger. Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1900.

does not relate to the beloved Napoleon. The editing has been well and thoroughly done ; for the first time the names left in blank in all former editions have been successfully filled in, and Mr. Welschinger has added to the whole an introductory essay on Mirabeau that is acceptable and readable. This said, one or two criticisms may not be out of place. The first of these relates to the title. Why name the book *La Mission Secrète de Mirabeau à Berlin* when in reality it is nothing more than an amplified edition of the *Histoire Secrète de la Cour d' Berlin*? What is meant is this. Mr. Welschinger had clearly two courses before him,—either to edit Mirabeau's original book, in which case his title should have been the original title,—or to relate the history of Mirabeau's mission, giving as a part of that history the text of the dispatches, in which case the title he has chosen would have been justified. Between these two courses Mr. Welschinger has hesitated ; he has given us perhaps more than an edition, certainly less than a history. Working in the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, he has filled the blanks left in all former editions with the names of the people for whom they stood ; he has added some interesting letters from Talleyrand to Mirabeau, and from Esterno to Vergennes ; further, he has collated Trenck and annotated profusely. Had he but gone a step further and adequately dealt with two difficult and obscure matters of great interest and vital importance he might have claimed to have given us a full and authoritative relation of a curious and, in some ways, mysterious international episode ; omitting these, as he practically does, he lays himself open to the criticism of incompleteness that has just been made. Mr. Welschinger makes no attempt to follow out either the financial interests that played so large a part in Mirabeau's mission to Berlin, or his relations with the secret societies, the Freemasons, the *Illuminés*, the German Union.

Besides, one or two criticisms of detail may be made. The dispatch Number XII. that is given under date August 22, was certainly written earlier, probably between the 10th and the 15th of that month. The date assigned to dispatch Number XVII. is obviously wrong.

Among the prominent figures of the French Revolution, that of Mirabeau is perhaps the most typical of that violent social upheaval, but beneath the rugged and hideous distortion of his large features was concealed immense common sense and a constructive genius that placed him far in front of most of his contemporaries. He appeared by his face, by the strange violence and passion of his life, by his flaming disregard for decency, for reserve, for honor, by the overflowing of his superabundant vital energy, to personify the

return to the state of nature preached in the literature of his time,—but to nature, not under its Watteau or Trianon aspect, not as seen from the banks of blue Geneva, but to ferocious, volcanic, all-devouring nature,—that of the *Septembriseurs* and of the *Carmagnole*. But under all his extraordinary lack of moral restraint, of respect for the rights and opinions of others, under all his overweening vanity and overbearing insolence and invective, Mirabeau was possessed of a keen, shrewd insight that showed him facts as they were, and not as they appeared. To this he added the rare power of clear and effective expression, which, when he wrote or spoke with sincerity, at times rose to the greatest height of forcible eloquence. He wrote letters (as some of these from Berlin) that in delicacy of wit and irony equal the most vaunted of Madame de Sévigné's, but that in force, in knowledge, in freedom from artifice, immeasurably surpass them. There was nothing mincing about Mirabeau. As the flow of his pen, so that of his tongue, and as his written words brought financial ruin and caused sovereigns to tremble, so those he spoke perhaps changed the face of Europe, might perhaps, had he lived, have saved a monarchy.

Gabriel Honoré de Riquetti, son of the Marquis de Mirabeau, was born in 1749. His father, known from the name of a successful pamphlet as *L'Ami des Hommes*, came from a family of *petite noblesse* that had for some generations been unfavorably known for the eccentricities of its members. The marquis duly maintained the traditions of his fathers, or surpassed them even; for in vice and profligacy he was a source of wonder even to that remarkable generation. His wife was not much better than he, and the quarrels and disorders of the couple were for some years the standing scandal of France.

The old marquis, among his other amiable peculiarities, was a domestic tyrant of the worst kind, for which, as well as for the vicious example their parents presented, his large family had to pay. Daughters were made to marry or to take the veil at the earliest possible age, and young Mirabeau was subjected to a system of harsh discipline totally unsuited to his precocious, expansive and intelligent nature.

The repression that had marked the period of his early education had not tended to improve his character. It was at length exchanged for the military service. Hardly had he entered on this career than he embarked on a series of grave disorders that resulted in imprisonment. After his release he served in an expedition to Corsica, and there, apparently, revealed military talents of a high order. Although only eighteen he was already beginning to im-

press those with whom he came into contact with a sense of his extraordinary powers. His uncle, who had no great love for him, says: "Unless the cleverest impostor in the world, he is of the finest stuff for the making of a pope, a captain by sea or land, a chancellor, or even an agriculturist."

Shortly after his return from Corsica, young Mirabeau married a wealthy *parti*, and settled down to a provincial life. But his idea of a quiet country life was all his own, he was soon in debt, and indulged himself in a violence of conduct, a viciousness of living and an overbearingness of manner that surpassed the worst eccentricities of his forefathers. His wife was not much better, and was unfaithful; finally a disgraceful and famous fracas, in which Madame de Cabris and Monsieur de Mouan were concerned, resulted in the intervention of the Marquis de Mirabeau, who obtained a *lettre de cachet* in virtue of which his unruly son was relegated to a royal prison. The restraint he was placed under appears to have been light; it allowed him sufficient liberty to make the acquaintance of the very commonplace Sophie, Marquise de Monnier; this lady, whose husband was too old to attract her, fell in love with the hideously ugly, but magnetically attractive prisoner. In the end she eloped with him, the guilty pair escaping to Holland with what of the husband's money the fair one had been able to purloin. It was during this first sojourn abroad that Mirabeau developed the power, which he had not long since discovered, of writing for the press. Pamphlets and reviews of books of a democratic character soon made him a name as an eloquent and dangerous pamphleteer. He might have resided in peace in Holland, but with characteristic violence in one of his productions he indulged himself in the luxury of a virulent attack on his father and friends; this resulted in his prompt arrest through the action of the French embassy at the Hague. In his absence from France he had been condemned to decapitation, but his fate was imprisonment at Vincennes, where he was destined to pass the next four years of his life.

It was while thus imprisoned, that Mirabeau composed his correspondence with Sophie, long considered his best work, the most effective passages of which should be read with a considerable grain of rhetorical salt. But this is not the place in which to dwell on this famous literary incident. The termination of his seclusion came as the result of the intercession of his father and of his wife, which he did not hesitate to abjectly entreat.

Then followed stormy times. The old marquis, the young count, and their wives, plunged into the vortex of conjugal and family disputes. Twisting and turning, lying and quibbling, they amazed the

public and even the lawyers with their venom, violence and turpitude; but furthest of all carried the Titan voice of young Mirabeau, and the loud and brazen speechifying that made of him, with his family, the public nuisance of France, revealed him to the world as her most splendid and masterful orator.

It was then, while he stood at the bar of astonished and scandalized public opinion, the most notorious character of France, his vices written large on his distorted, bloated, pock-marked face, that Henriette van Haren, better known as Madame de Nehra, met him. She was only nineteen and knew little of the world. With all the spontaneous courage of her age, and after conquering the first natural movement of repulsion, she fell under the irresistible spell of the monster and determined to throw in her lot with his. It was with this young girl, of whom her contemporaries never spoke but with respect and regard, that Mirabeau spent the next few years of his tempestuous life,—they were to be those in which his excesses were least conspicuous, and his manners and thought least extravagant.

From the uproar and resentments he had aroused in his native land, the unrestrainable pamphleteer sought a refuge in England; there he met many prominent men, assisted at sittings of the House of Commons, continued to publish, and voraciously to read whatever came to hand, especially the works of the economists. From what Mirabeau saw, heard, and read on this visit, may be traced many of the political, financial and administrative ideas that he turned to such good use afterwards as a member of the *Assemblée Nationale*. Expatriation, however, soon proved irksome; Madame de Nehra crossed the channel and succeeded in obtaining an assurance from Breteuil that Mirabeau would be unmolested if he went back to Paris. He accordingly returned and became engaged in a new series of events that were to culminate in the mission to Berlin.

Among the pamphlets published by Mirabeau during his stay in England was one dealing with the stock-jobbing that was a prevalent mania of his time. Having returned to Paris, he continued to devote much of his attention to things financial, and in 1785 brought out *La Liberté de l'Escompte* ("on the non-restraint of discount"). This attracted the attention of the well-known Swiss bankers, Panchaud and Clavière; they soon made the acquaintance of the pamphleteer. Panchaud was the biggest operator in stocks of Paris, and, like his successors of the present day, placed much reliance on secret and exclusive information and on the influencing of public opinion through the press; he was surrounded by a large

circle of aristocratic hangers-on. Panchaud was also a freemason, and finance, free-masonry, and the opposition aristocracy all jostled very closely in his *salons*. It was there that Mirabeau met the Duc de Chartres, the most important personage in the masonic world, soon to be known as Philippe Égalité, Duc d'Orléans, his boon companion, the Duc de Lauzun, and, among others, the Abbé de Périgord, who achieved renown later as the Prince de Talleyrand. Here then was the greatest practical intellect of the day, a man with no other principle than that of his own advancement, placed at the centre of all financial and secret intrigue, in the midst of the shrewdest bankers, the most scheming adventurers and the most unprejudiced and ambitious politicians of France. What Mr. Welschinger has failed to bring out is that in this group was concentrated a power of money, of intellect and of secret intrigue, that made of it one of the principal forces of France.

The bankers' ring having secured this new and invaluable ally were not long in putting his powers to the test. It so happened that Calonne, controller of the King's finances, who since he had succeeded Necker two years before, had been engaged in a perpetual struggle to stave off bankruptcy, had arrived at the opinion that the secret of the low quotations of the state securities was the inflated price to which speculation had sent the shares of certain public companies. From this opinion, the controller drew a sage conclusion: if the quotations of the great speculative securities could be brought down to something like a representative price, the state securities would then attract more attention and rise in value. Starting from a totally different point of view, the bankers' ring were also anxious to depreciate the prices of certain gambling stocks, though it may be surmised that it was not in the expectation of seeing the state securities benefit from a big fall of prices. Be that as it may, Calonne and the ring, working together, intrusted their work to Mirabeau, and wonderfully well did he perform it. Clavière crammed him with the facts, and he put them into brilliant and masterly prose; with so much expedition did he labor, it is said, that one production of three hundred pages only occupied him eight days. Before the avalanche of abuse, ridicule and invective thus showered forth, the shares of the Bank of St. Charles fell from 800 to 320, the Paris Water-Works fell 44 %, the Caisse d'Escompte dropped in sympathy, despite the efforts of Beaumarchais and his friends, and a financial panic ensued in which every quoted security, including of course those of the state, fell heavily. Panchaud, Clavière and their friends netted large profits over the operation, but as to poor M. de Calonne, he gained nothing but a somewhat expensive lesson in

finance at heavy cost to his pocket and to that of the King. Angered at the unexpected and fatal result of the pamphleteer's eloquence, Calonne turned furiously against Mirabeau, and the latter, for his own protection, prepared a violent pamphlet against the minister, showing the latter's financial iniquities in the most merciless light. Armed with this unpublished tirade, as with a loaded pistol held at the controller's head, Mirabeau, with his powerful backing, was in a position to make terms. It was decided that he should leave Paris; his services being no longer urgently required, it was as well to utilize his talents in some new direction. This was what the bankers' group, or let us say Panchaud, Clavière, Talleyrand, Lauzun, arranged, with the consent of the pamphleteer. He was to go to Berlin where, through the relations of the Amis Réunis, a sect of Freemasons concerning which something more will appear presently, they had a secret means of acting. Mirabeau was to spy out the land,—politically, for the benefit of Calonne and the government,—financially, for that of his friends who had their eyes fixed on Frederick the Great's hoarded millions, and vaguely contemplated the establishment of a bank at Berlin. In addition to these objects, in which others were interested, Mirabeau may be conjectured to have had in mind that he might find, to his own profit, some opening suitable to his talents in the Prussian administration, that he might reveal himself in so brilliant a light as to force his way into the French diplomatic service, or that he might, at the worst, find new material on which to found a new series of his ever flowing publications.

Mirabeau left France on his German adventure at the end of the year 1785. Mr. Welschinger states that his only letter of recommendation was one from Vergennes, Minister of Foreign Affairs, to Esterno, French ambassador at Berlin. This statement must be taken for what it is worth, and cannot be accepted as correct from the narrow standpoint of strict proof. It is more than probable that Mirabeau was furnished with at least equally important recommendations from the French bankers to their German correspondents and from the Amis Réunis to the highest masonic and other secret circles at Berlin. Besides this, he was already in close relations with Major Mauvillon, with whom he was collaborating a history of Frederick the Great; this officer was a prominent "Illuminé," and it is noticeable that among others of the Frenchman's earliest acquaintances in Germany may be noted the names of such well-known "Illuminés" as Charles von Struensee, Nicolai, Luchet, and others; it was the latter who wrote the *Essai sur les Illuminés* that has been wrongly ascribed to Mirabeau. In addition to these already suffi-

cient openings, the French pamphleteer may be guessed to have had easy access to the circle in which Barth, Nicolai and Walther were conspicuous, or in other words, to the "German Union." Mr. Welschinger's hesitation at entering this very obscure field of history may be easily understood, for the authorities are contradictory, uncertain and misleading, but however difficult and unsatisfactory the task, it may be better to attempt to give some sort of indication of what must ever remain a very obscure chapter of history, than to take the course Mr. Welschinger does of ignoring what is incapable of strict proof. Unless some general view of the operations of the secret societies of France and Germany be obtained, no correct survey of the basis of Mirabeau's mission to Berlin can be had.

France and Germany, not to mention other parts of Europe, were at that time sown with masonic lodges, but the practice of the Masons of the two countries differed widely, as did that of the individual lodges. In France, new sects arose, and rites of all sorts, some of them wildly extravagant. Still, as a whole, the lodges remained essentially masonic in character. Without giving an extended account of the sects, and of the peculiarities of such lodges as those of the "Chevaliers Bienfaisants" of Lyons, or of the "Contrat Social" at Paris, without dwelling on the Martinistes, the Amis Réunis and the Philalethes, or on such excesses as were committed, for instance, at Ermenonville under the guidance of the quack St. Germain, the only fact that need be insisted on is that a great body of French Masons were grouped as Philalethes, or Amis Réunis, into the "Grand Orient" of France under the Mastership of the Duc de Chartres, afterwards Duc d'Orléans, and that the Panchaud-Talleyrand group were within the innermost circle. Among the foreign correspondents of this group, it is as nearly certain as possible that Ferdinand of Brunswick, Mauvillon and d'Alberg can be placed, the latter then, as in later days, a far more important personage than he appeared to the public. Leaving the Amis Réunis for the present, let us cross the frontier.

In Germany, the Masons had not gone so far in variation and complexity of ritual as in France, though the "strict observance," in which the Duke of Brunswick took a prominent part, deserves mention; on the other hand, several secret societies arose from among the masonic lodges, with well defined and advanced programmes. Leaving on one side the Rosicrucians, who need not enter into the subject and who may be dismissed as an offshoot of masonry, the most famous of these were the *Illuminati* or *Illuminés*, as they shall be called here. The founder of this society was a

professor of the University of Ingolstadt, Weisshaupt by name. The principal object of the association was, if the truth be told, to concentrate as much power as possible in the hands of its founder. But to those initiated into its highest grades and most solemn mysteries, the doctrines of the equality of men, of the falsity of religion, and of the foundation of the universal republic were gradually unfolded. Illuminism spread with tremendous rapidity, chiefly in masonic circles, and received accessions from even the highest ranks ; for some years it flourished unsuspected. Finally the Elector of Bavaria first suspected, then discovered it, and it was ostensibly suppressed in 1783. But the only result of the steps taken by the Elector was to break up the centre of the society, to put an end to the leadership of Weisshaupt ; the Illuminés continued to flourish in various parts of Germany under a variety of forms for some years, and included among their members representatives of all classes, even of royalty, though the latter, it may be guessed, never reached the highest grades. From among the Illuminés arose the less important but very curious "German Union." The programme and the doctrines of the latter resembled closely those of the former, but it had a business side. It included all the principal publishers of Germany, and their aim was to convert it into a secret trade-guild giving them a monopoly of public opinion and of publishing profits. It was to be a secret continuation under a somewhat more convenient style of the ancient *Gelehrtenbuchhandlung*. Under cover of the reading-rooms and literary clubs which the German Union instituted, it was sought to control the thinking public by decrees issued from Leipzig. The *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek* and the *Berlinische Monatschrift* were the organs of the German Union ; Mirabeau assiduously studied both these publications. The importance of this curious society was short-lived and never very great ; the scandal of Dr. Barth finished it.

Among the Masons and their offshoots on both sides of the frontier, Mesmer, Cagliostro, Lavater, St. Germain and all the quacks and spiritualists prospered. But it is a mistake to identify any of these men, or the movements they exploited, with any or all of the societies named. Some lodges and many Masons, Illuminés and others, doubtless fell under their influence, while they were always ready to enroll and proclaim themselves members of these societies. But other lodges, other Masons and Illuminés despised and ridiculed them. Men with hard heads like Mirabeau, Weisshaupt, Talleyrand and Nicolai, were not to be taken in by jugglery and charlatanism, even if King Frederick William and Fräulein von Voss were.

Having thus briefly called attention to a state of affairs that placed Mirabeau in a position in many ways advantageous and exceptional, we must return to an account of his journey.

Immediately on his arrival at Berlin, he characteristically wrote to the old King asking for an audience. Frederick, with his usual expedition, immediately answered the French traveller, granting his request. A first interview was followed by several others, and established Mirabeau as a person of importance at Berlin. In the meanwhile he saw much of Mauvillon and moved in literary and diplomatic circles. He appears to have particularly cultivated the acquaintance of Von Dohm of the Prussian Foreign Ministry, of Prince Henry, the King's brother, and of Ewart, the very clever first secretary of the British legation, who was to prove in the near future at least as clever a diplomat as Mirabeau himself. Esterno, the French ambassador, a man of little judgment and no weight, was evidently not delighted at the appearance of this irregular representative of the French ministry, and in his dispatches to Vergennes showed considerable animus against the new-comer.

As usual, the indefatigable French pamphleteer was not long idle ; absorbing the new facts about him with the utmost facility, he gave them out again adorned with the brilliancy of form which he knew how to impart. At this period he came within the influence of the great German publisher Nicolai, a prominent Illuminé and member of the German Union, and did much literary work for him, including, it is probable, the writing of some violent attacks on the Prussian political system and administration. His principal acknowledged production was a defence of the famous Jewish philosopher, Moses Mendelssohn, a friend of Nicolai's.

But political affairs were the ostensible object of Mirabeau's journey, and he accordingly prepared for M. de Calonne a *Memorandum* on the European situation. The statements contained in this document we need not follow, but, to place the reader at the right point of view for judging of what is to ensue, the position of affairs in Europe, as they might appear in Berlin, must now be briefly summed up.

By far the most important and interesting figure on the stage of politics was that of the aged King of Prussia. The terrible Seven Years' War had left the great Frederick in possession of desolated Silesia, and had established his reputation as the greatest general since Julius Caesar. The period of war over, he had ruled his subjects stringently, but with economy, had drilled his splendid army to his heart's content, and had cultivated the arts of peace. The greatest personal prestige in Europe was his, the most perfectly organized army and the largest reserve of gold. As against this, Prussia was

actuated by no very well-defined aggressive ambition ; the one point on which her foreign policy was likely to lead her into difficulties shall be indicated presently.

Russia, under Catherine II., was principally occupied in repressing Poland and extending her borders at the expense of Turkey. The affairs of Sweden and Courland need not be noticed here.

Austria, under Joseph II., was on amicable terms with Russia, and also with France, through the Emperor's sister, Marie Antoinette. Up to the year 1786, his chief preoccupation had been internal reforms of a liberal character ; from that date, his policy became one of expansion towards the south. Yet Prussia viewed with suspicion the son of Maria Theresa, and could never feel entirely certain that the conquest of Silesia was forgotten and that the Emperor would not some day attempt its recovery or perhaps seek compensation in some other direction.

England was fast recovering from the effects of the disastrous war which, arising out of the foolish policy pursued towards her American colonies, had resulted in the humiliating treaty of Paris. Wiser counsels were now in the ascendant, the younger Pitt had commenced his administration of affairs, and the public funds were rising by leaps and bounds. Commerce and finance now engrossed the attention of England's statesmen, while on the Continent such shrewd men as Harris, Dalrymple and Ewart were rapidly increasing her lately impaired influence.

France was on the verge of a great revolution ; for a century past her monarchs and ministers had, with but rare exceptions, been distinguished for nothing but profligacy, dishonesty and incompetence. Yet the wealth of the country had increased, principally through the exertions of the middle class, professional and mercantile, that had vastly increased in numbers and importance. Finance and speculation had been introduced, and notwithstanding one or two panics, the extent of the banking and company operations testified, not only to the wealth, but to the enterprise of the country. Alongside of this class, in which intelligence, whether honest or otherwise, was the one means of success, arose a school of writers of whom Diderot, Voltaire and Rousseau may be recalled ; these literary giants and their followers, together with the French travellers and soldiers who had visited America at the time of the War of Independence, had set the fashion of thinking towards the natural rights of man, and against maladministration and despotism. Last of all, the condition of the masses was deplorable, and worse, in that it was largely remediable. The farming of the revenue, the restrictions on inland circulation, the improvidence, incapacity and dishonesty of

those in high places were plagues that occasionally brought terrible results. While in one part of France a surplus of wheat brought its owners no return, in a neighboring province the people would be eating grass, and dying of starvation. The finances of a country, that a very few years of good administration should have made wealthy, had been reduced by the long infliction of divine right, incapacity, and aristocratic robbery, to a state of chaos and bankruptcy; under an unintelligent and obstinate king and senseless and venal ministers, France was fast sinking into the gulf of revolution.

The chief preoccupation of the western powers was the question of Holland. The curious constitution of that country, an incompatible mixture of monarchism and republicanism, was always giving rise to trouble between stadholders of the House of Orange and the democratic party. One of these periodical difficulties was now engrossing the attention of European diplomacy. Wilhelmina, niece of Frederick, sister of the Prince of Prussia, afterwards Frederick William II., was the wife of the stadholder, so that the House of Orange had a family claim to the support of the royal house of Prussia as well as to that of Great Britain. The English diplomats were striving hard to effect a *rapprochement* between the two powers on this question, thereby hoping to strengthen their country's European position by bringing her into line once more with the great military power of Frederick. France, in a spirit of half-hearted opposition to England, had been supporting the democratic party in Holland; the questions a French statesman might well ask himself were these: How would the probably early death of Frederick affect the situation? Would Austria be persuaded to bring pressure to bear on Prussia, either in the direction of Silesia, or by attempting the succession of the childless Elector of Bavaria? Could an understanding on the question of Holland be effected? How could a *rapprochement* or alliance between England and Prussia be prevented? In his memorial to Calonne, which is dated June 2, 1786, Mirabeau predicts the death of Frederick within two months (a very shrewd guess as will be seen). After brilliantly summing up the international position, not without a passing stab at Esterno, he concludes that the best line of policy for France is to come to terms with Prussia and England on the basis of a reciprocal guarantee of actual possessions. For bait to England, he places foremost a commercial treaty which he well knew would coincide with the views of Pitt, of his friends in Paris, and of the French ministers.

France had one or two good cards to play and the diplomatic *volte-face* recommended by Mirabeau was not only feasible, but

offered many advantages. The anxiety of the English diplomats at that time may well be exemplified by a quotation from a dispatch from Sir James Harris, then minister at the Hague and afterwards better known as Lord Malmesbury, to Lord Carmarthen; it is dated February 26, 1786. Alluding to Mirabeau, he writes: " . . . I must needs confess . . . that I strongly admit in my own mind the belief of a secret understanding and fellow feeling between Prussia and France, and that they say to each other, as Molière's doctors,—*Passez moi la rhubarbe, et je vous passerai le séné.*—Let me alone in Holland, says France, and you, Prussia, shall have nothing to fear in Bavaria."

For a few days of June Mirabeau returned to Paris. The views he had so ably presented had been heartily indorsed by the clique; Calonne, easily influenced, and still dreading the terrible unpublished pamphlet that was to expose his financial iniquities to the public, was persuaded to agree to Mirabeau's return to Berlin as secret agent of the government. It was arranged that his dispatches should be sent through the intermediary of Talleyrand, whose task it would be to decipher them and to present them to the minister; it was also further arranged that Calonne should supply the necessary funds.

It was while on this brief visit to Paris that Mirabeau is asserted (by Barruel, Robison and other authorities of the same class) to have introduced the secret organization and doctrines of the Illuminés into France. It is said that he had been initiated by Mauvillon and that his journey to Paris had for its principal object the initiation of Talleyrand, Orléans, Lauzun, and other prominent members of the Grand Orient. Such a statement, derived by Barruel from an unknown source, is not made to command confidence, at the same time it would be a mistake to reject a statement, otherwise probable, merely because it owes its origin to that not very scientific historian. Whether Mirabeau was an Illuminé or not can probably never be proved now, but that he was is at least highly probable (notwithstanding his own disclaimers); that he initiated his friends on the occasion of his visit to Paris in June, 1786, is just as incapable of proof, but there is nothing inherently improbable about it, though it is quite certain that such an occurrence cannot be assigned to September, 1786, as has been done by some writers, for Mirabeau spent most of that month in Dresden.

The sixty-six dispatches sent to Talleyrand from Berlin are full of interest from the first line to the last; at times they rise to the highest pitch of literary merit; they are never dull. Mirabeau surveys everything that the court of Prussia can show with the keen

and cynical eye of a philosopher and political free-lance. His observations on matters commercial, financial, political and social, are vivid and full of food for reflection, but he does not hesitate to vent his spite, when the occasion serves, and to relate scandalous stories about the highest personages, calculated to tickle the highly seasoned palates of Talleyrand and his other good friends, and, when he believes that by so doing he can further his own interests, to boldly invent facts. It is not possible within the space of this article to go through these dispatches at length; only a few points of interest will be touched on, and the reader who would have the whole of the *chronique scandaleuse* of Berlin, the story of Fräulein von Voss and all the rest, must be referred to Mr. Welschinger's edition.

When Mirabeau reached Berlin in July, the public attention was centred on the last hours of the fast-failing Frederick. Copious details of the state of the King were sent off to Talleyrand by every courier; on August 2 it is related that: "Frese (the King's doctor at Potsdam) is still very much in disgrace for having dared utter the word,—dropsy,—in answer to a summons to state, as a man of honor, the name and character of the disease. The King suffers from fits of shivering and is constantly wrapped in rugs and covered with quilts. He has not been to bed for six weeks. . . . What seems certain is that 'we' do not wish to die. . . . at all events the mind is not affected, and 'we' are even working particularly hard."

How Mirabeau heard of the death of the King, is related in the following lively manner, under date August 17:

"The event is accomplished, Frederick William reigns, and one of the grandest characters ever formed by nature is dissolved. My firm resolve of friendly duty was that you should have the earliest news of this event, and my measures had been taken with the greatest care. At eight on the morning of Wednesday, I already knew that 'we' were at the last extremity; that the day before 'we' had only given the pass-word at twelve instead of at eleven as usual; that it was noon before 'we' had spoken to the secretaries who had been in attendance since five; that notwithstanding this, the dispatches had been clear and precise; that 'we' had again eaten immoderately, notably a lobster. Besides all this, I was aware that the lack of cleanliness prevailing about the patient's room and about him . . . had set up a sort of putrid fever; that the somnolence of that day, Wednesday, was nearly lethargic; that everything announced a hydropic apoplexy, a dissolution of the brain, and, in fine, that a few hours must in all probability witness the closing scene. At one o'clock I was on horseback on the road to Potsdam, drawn by some vague presentiment, when a groom came galloping by for Doctor Zelle, who was ordered not to lose a minute and who started at once. I soon learnt that the groom had killed his horse. . . . I hastened to the French minister's; he was out; he was dining at Charlottenburg, no means of meeting him at Berlin. I got myself dressed; I

start for Schoenhausen and arrive at the Queen's at the same time as our representative ; he had no details and had no idea the King was in so serious a condition ; not one of the ministers would believe it. Lord Dalrymple, with whom I am on too good terms to dissemble, assured me I was mistaken. I answered, ' Possibly ; ' but I whispered to our minister that my news was from the bedside, and that he would be well advised to believe that a speculator might possibly be as well informed as a diplomat." . . .

Mirabeau then goes on to describe the steps he took for insuring the safe dispatch of the great news to France ; special couriers outside the walls, pigeons, and so forth ; his precautions were infinite, for it was certain that the Prussian government would, at the first moment, put an embargo on all news.

" M. de Nolde was just leaving at half-past six in the morning, when General Goertz, aide-de-camp to the late King, came up at a tearing gallop, shouting :—By order of the King, close the gates, and so M. de Nolde had to turn back. Within five minutes I was mounted, (my horses had remained saddled all night), and, to accomplish my fullest duty, galloped off to the French minister's ; he was asleep ; I at once wrote that I had safe means of communication in case he had any occasion for such a convenience ; he answered, (and I have kept his note as a curious memento in case, though I can hardly believe it, M. de Vergennes should receive no dispatch) ;—' Le Comte d'Esterno has the honor of thanking Monsieur le Comte de Mirabeau ; he will not avail himself of his obliging offer.' "

The accession of the Prince of Prussia to the throne left vacant by the death of his illustrious uncle gave rise to all the ambitions and uncertainties usual in such cases. A man of Mirabeau's temperament was not likely to be the last to bring himself to the notice of a new monarch from whom anything might be expected, he therefore composed a memorial, afterwards published under the title of *Lettre remise à Frédéric Guillaume II.*, which Mr. Welschinger would have been well advised had he added to his appendix.

Frederick William was an unknown quantity ; he was thought to be adverse to the routine of business and known to be addicted to pleasure. Would the new duties of his elevated station effect a change in him ? Prussia stood in need of reform ; Frederick had been economical and had accumulated a large reserve of gold, but his financial system had none the less been badly organized and disorderly ; it required radical alterations. Would the new king undertake them ? Could he be persuaded to intrust them to a really capable financier ? Would he be willing to earn an income by investing the gold of his predecessors in some remunerative manner to be indicated by such skilled financiers as Panchaud, Struensee, Mirabeau ?

Frederick William might have done worse, as the sequel proved, than take the French adventurer as his financial adviser, and this was doubtless the opinion of Mirabeau himself. His letter to Frederick William is a high pitched but fine piece of rhetorical flattery and advice ; it merits perusal as it is most characteristic of the writer. There is some internal evidence that tends to show that this letter was addressed by one Illuminé to another.

In the early days of the new reign it was expected that great authority would be exercised by Prince Henry, brother of the late king, but Frederick William soon showed that, even if he was not disposed to do the hard work of his station, he had no intention of sharing any of its authority. Neither with the King, nor with Prince Henry, to both of whom he made all possible advances, did Mirabeau succeed in improving his position ; he was too French and too heroic a remedy for the ills of Prussia.

Before the coolness of the King, and because of his equivocal unofficial position, Mirabeau soon found himself at a standstill ; a fortnight after the accession he writes :

“It is becoming very difficult to observe the King. He is introducing the strictest ceremonial of German etiquette. It is said that he will not receive foreigners, at all events for a while. I shall of course be informed of what is going on by the spying of valets, courtiers and secretaries, and also by the intemperate outbursts of Prince Henry ; but there are only two ways of really exercising influence here, that is in giving, or rather in suggesting, ideas to the master or to his ministers. To the master? How can I, as we do not meet? To the ministers? It is neither easy nor proper for me to broach business with them since I am not accredited, and those discussions that do arise by chance are short, vague, and interrupted. If my services are considered useful, I should be sent where I can be accredited, otherwise I shall cost more here than I am worth.”

The question of Holland, that was eventually to lead to Prussian intervention, was fast coming to a head. Ewart, a very young diplomat, whose early death closed an interesting and promising career, was temporarily in charge of the British embassy at Berlin, and was successfully negotiating an understanding with the Prussian ministers. Mirabeau, with no official position, unsupported and unheeded by the ministers at Versailles, could do little to place France in a better position, and was condemned to look on while the friendship of England and Prussia became every day closer. If powerless and playing a losing game, he at all events kept his wits about him. The representative of England was beginning to assume a high tone about the rights of the Stadholder of Holland : “Yesterday, Mr. Ewart,” writes Mirabeau, “secretary of the English legation, in the presence of fifteen people, M. de Hertzberg backing

him up the while by word and by gesture, addressed these very words to me,—The Stadholder is constitutionally the executive power of Holland, or, to put it more clearly, his position in Holland is precisely similar to that of the King in England. I answered with frigid irony,—Let us therefore hope the Hollanders will not cut his head off. The laugh was not with Mr. Ewart !”

To conclude with the affairs of Holland, it may be noted that not the least interesting of Mirabeau's dispatches from Berlin are those that refer to the efforts made by him to recover the ground lost by French diplomacy in this business. His arguments are plausible and show a fine grasp of political principles, but they leave an overwhelming impression of the falsity of the writer. It must be pronounced more than probable that both in the case of the negotiations with the Duke of Brunswick and with Baron de Reede, Mirabeau was actively engaged inventing diplomatic positions with the sole object of thereby securing his employment in the French diplomatic service.

On a small point of etiquette, a stupid slight had been put on the French ambassador ; Mirabeau relates, in a pungent letter, how Frederick William tried to efface the bad impression that had been created.

“I shall commence this dispatch with some perfectly authentic information that appears to me decisive as to the character of the new reign. I will recall what I wrote on the 29th of August.—‘The King seems to have determined to give up all his old habits ; it is a noble effort ! He retires before ten, he rises at four. . . . If only he perseveres he will afford a unique example of the habits of thirty years conquered. If he succeeds, he will reveal a force of character that will prove too much for all of us.’ Well ! like all the rest I was taken in by appearances. The truth is that at half-past nine, while we thought him asleep, he was celebrating Sardanapalian orgies in the innermost apartments of the palace. . . . What sort of mortal then is the master ? I still think it would be hasty to come to a conclusion to-day, but one is tempted to answer,—the king of weaklings. No wit, no strength, no logic, no application, the taste of the hog of Epicurus, and of the heroic, nothing but pride, unless I mistake for that quality a narrow, shopkeeping vanity. . . . However I am not engaged on a second volume of *Madame de Sévigné*. I am not speaking evil of Frederick William because I have nothing to do with him, as she used to praise Louis XIV. because he had just made her dance a minuet. Yesterday at the Queen's circle he three times addressed me, and this for the first time in public. ‘You have been to Magdeburg and Brunswick ?’ ‘Yes, Sire.’ ‘What did you think of the manoeuvres ?’ ‘I admired greatly.’ ‘I am asking you for the truth and not for a compliment.’ ‘Sire, the truth is to me that only the presence of Your Majesty could have enhanced such a superb sight.’ ‘And how is the Duke ?’ ‘Perfectly well, Sire.’ ‘Will he soon be here ?’ ‘Your Majesty alone can know.’ . . . He smiled . . . That is a sample ! You may well imagine that what is said before the whole court is a matter

of total indifference to me ; but with the spectators it is far otherwise, and I note this as having been intended as some sort of reparation to France ! ”

In his dispatch of December 2, 1786, occurs a curious passage, too long to quote, in which Mirabeau with many expressions of dislike and horror describes proceedings and rites of initiation which he ascribes to the Illuminés. Among many authentic descriptions of Rosicrucian, Masonic and Illuminé ceremonies none can be found to tally with the one here given, and it bears every appearance of being fictitious and of having been written for other eyes than those of Talleyrand.

As early as the end of October the expatriated pamphleteer was tiring of his not very satisfactory, and unfruitful mission. Politically there was nothing to be done, the millions of Frederick seemed no nearer the safes of Panchaud's bank, or the linings of Mirabeau's pockets. He writes : “ I am full of disgust and lassitude ; I appeal to your honor and friendship to tell me what I am, what I am doing, where I am being carried, or to arrange matters so that I may again enjoy freedom. The editors will deal with me more kindly than our rulers do, and I shall not be called on to treat them so tenderly. I will perform anything at the bidding of friendship, but not at that of those in authority, and I should be a great fool to exert myself more in their behalf than they do themselves.”

Whenever the irascible exile gave forth threats, Talleyrand, prompted by Calonne as we may guess, poured oil on the troubled waters, as witness the following extract from a letter of the Abbé to Mirabeau in which, if flattery occupies a large place, the proportion of truth must remain highly problematical : “ We are more than pleased with your correspondence, as I hear repeated every day. The King reads it with the utmost interest. M. de Calonne thanks you for your promptness, for the care with which your dispatches are drawn ; I have laid emphasis on the excellence of your statistical information. The value of your work has been appreciated.”

In the month of January, 1787, Mirabeau had come to the final conclusion that he had nothing to hope from either Frederick William or Calonne. He could do nothing more at Berlin. On the 13th of that month he wrote to Talleyrand a letter which shall be the last noticed here and in which occur the following passages :

“ Never did kingdom show more symptoms of rapid decline than this. It is being undermined from all sides at once. Sources of revenue cut off ; expenses increased ; principles out of fashion ; public opinion wasted ; the army weakened ; the few useful men discouraged ;

those for whom others have been made discontented, now discontented themselves; all meritorious foreigners sent packing; for the sake of appearing to rule alone only rascallions promoted. . . . I might remain here ten years without giving you any new facts, though doubtless many details. . . . What is to be my function in the future? Nothing useful; but usefulness, and that great, immediate, direct, is the only thing that could make me longer tolerate this ambiguous position. Once more I repeat, what I deserve, what I can do, what I am worth, must now be decided by the King and his ministers. If I neither deserve, nor am capable of accomplishing anything, I am costing the King too much. If I do deserve and if I am capable of anything. . . I owe it to myself to ask for and to obtain some position, or to go back to my old trade of citizen of the world that will be less fatiguing to body and mind and less unfruitful of fame."

A week later Mirabeau had written the last of his dispatches from Berlin and was on his way to Paris. He had accomplished nothing, but had learned much, and passed a diplomatic apprenticeship that was soon to stand him in good stead. His keen political instinct had detected in the convoking of the Notables of France, then just decided on (perhaps at his advice), the first note of the revolution; the time was fast approaching when his eloquence was to sway the fortunes of King and of people from the tribune of the *Assemblée Nationale*.

It is uncertain what prompted Mirabeau to publish his correspondence from Berlin two years later. Mr. Welschinger thinks that it was owing to pressure for money, and that would appear the best opinion. But it may be taken as certain that Mirabeau, then on the point of appealing to the people to support him against the Crown, had quite realized the impression these documents would produce of the incapacity of the French ministers and of their diplomatic agents, and also of his own superior ability. Whatever his motives, few who have read the dispatches will defend the act.

No one before Mr. Welschinger had attempted the task he has so successfully accomplished. As an editor, he has left little for a successor to do; it has perhaps been shown that, from the point of view of the historian, there is yet much to be done before the tangle of the hidden threads of the operations, diplomatic, financial, and social, of Mirabeau at Berlin is unravelled.

R. M. JOHNSTON.

THE TURKISH CAPITULATIONS

SINCE the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 the relations of the Western Nations to the Ottoman Empire have been in many respects unique. These relations were determined and defined by decrees of the sultans, who granted large privileges and powers to Europeans resident on their soil. To these decrees in due time the name of Capitulations was given, apparently for the reason that they were divided into articles or chapters. They were personal grants, valid only for the life of the grantor. Hence they were renewed, often with modifications, on the accession of a new sultan. So we find many Capitulations made with France, England and other states. The earliest of these Capitulations, to which reference is now made for authority, is that of 1535, with Francis I. of France. It is more specific and formal than any previous decree. It remained practically in force for 300 years.

It is an interesting fact that concessions similar to those made in the Turkish Capitulations were granted to foreigners in the Orient prior to the establishment of the Ottoman power in the Levant. There is a tradition that ten centuries ago Arab traders were admitted to Canton with permission to erect a mosque, and have a *cadi* and their own laws;¹ and another that about the same time the califs of Egypt granted similar privileges to the merchants of Amalfi. It is certain that in the Latin colonies in the Greek Empire and on the coast of Africa and of Syria in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the traders from Amalfi and Venice carried with them their local laws and jurisdiction. After the crusades the Frankish barons holding eastern ports sought successfully to attract western trade by releasing it from many of the burdens imposed on it in Italy and France in the form of taxes, imposts, the *droit d'aubaine*, etc. The foreign community or colony was governed under the laws of its own land by a consul, or an official having some other title, but invested with the powers of a magistrate. In the Mussulman states of Northern Africa and the Levant, in the fourteenth century the foreigners of each nation were often gathered in one large establishment with their shops, their chapel and their consular residence. At the same period in the Greek Empire and in Chris-

¹ Travers Twiss in *Revue de Droit International*, 1893, p. 207. Pardessus, *Lois Maritimes*, II., p. cxxxviii.

tian states in Syria the foreigners received sometimes the concession of a whole street or even of a quarter of the city for their churches, residences, mills and baths, and in some cases of lands adjacent to the city. But in all these Oriental states the western merchants had the privilege of extraterritorial jurisdiction. These concessions seem to have been due to a recognition of the wide difference between the eastern and the western civilization, laws, customs and manners, and to have been deemed conducive to the harmonious life of the natives and the foreigners. They were a natural outgrowth of the conditions in which these peoples of diverse origins found themselves and were regarded as no more beneficial to the foreigners than to the natives.

Pradier Fodéré, who gave special study to this subject, thinks that the Mohammedans were very ready to grant large privileges to the foreign merchants because of their disinclination to leave their own country for the purposes of trade, and because of their lack of experience in navigation, and their need of attracting foreigners to make use of their extended coast, their fine harbors and their abundant products.¹

As Mohammed II., when he captured Constantinople in 1453, was familiar with these usages, which had been followed in Moslem and Christian seaports of the Levant for three or four centuries, and which on the whole had contributed to the harmony between the natives and the foreigners, it is not surprising that he decided to grant to the foreign residents in his domain substantially the same privileges which they had previously enjoyed. It afforded him the simplest and easiest method of administration. It was for his convenience quite as much as for theirs that he left large liberty to the conquered Greeks, and soon confirmed to the Greeks and Venetians and other nations the privileges they had enjoyed under the old Empire. He was inspired by real statesmanship. It may well be doubted whether he supposed that he was exercising special generosity to the foreign powers.

When Francis I. of France found himself engaged in his great conflict with the Emperor Charles V., he threw aside the scruples which Christian sovereigns had generally entertained against forming an alliance with the Moslems, and sought the friendship of the Sultan Suleiman, who was also opposing the German Emperor. One of the results of this friendship was the granting by the Sultan of what is generally called the First Capitulation. Unhappily the text of this important document is lost. But as we have later Capitulations, which we have every reason to suppose do not differ es-

¹ *Revue de Droit International*, 1869, p. 119.

entially from the first, we are reasonably sure of its import. It seems to have been in form, not a treaty, but a unilateral document, a grant or concession by the Sultan to his friend, the King of France. It permitted to French subjects the rights of residence, trade and local jurisdiction which have been since 1535 enjoyed by them. The Capitulation which is now generally cited as the basis of the rights claimed by foreigners is that of 1740. Since by Capitulations and later by treaties other nations have received the same rights as "the Franks," all nations refer back to the Capitulation of 1740 to sustain their claims.

The substance of the concessions in the chief Capitulations was as follows: The Franks were to have the liberty to travel in all parts of the Ottoman Empire. They were to carry on trade according to their own laws and usages. They were to have liberty of worship. They were to be free from all duties save customs duties. They were to enjoy inviolability of domicile. Their ambassadors and consuls were to have extraterritorial jurisdiction over them. Even if they committed a crime, they were to be arrested by an Ottoman official only in the presence of a consular or diplomatic official of their own country. The Ottoman officers, if asked by a consular or diplomatic officer to aid in the arrest of a French subject, must render such service. The Franks had the full right of making wills. If they died intestate in Turkey, their own consul must take possession of their property and remit it to their heirs. In fact, the Franks and other nations at last had *imperia in imperio*.

Naturally enough other western powers soon sought to secure the same privileges as France. In 1579 Queen Elizabeth endeavored to secure the favor of the Sultan by reminding him that like him she and her subjects were opposed to the worship of images. This remarkable attempt to show a resemblance between Protestantism and Mohammedanism was not immediately successful in the face of French opposition. But in 1583 the Queen did succeed in establishing relations with the Sultan and appointed William Harebone ambassador. The Capitulation was afterwards many times renewed. The Netherlands received a Capitulation in 1609, and Austria in 1615.

In 1673 France obtained a new power, namely, the exclusive right of protecting under her flag the subjects of sovereigns who had received no Capitulations. This gave her prestige in Western Europe, and placed several Powers under obligations to her. But in 1675 England after a vigorous effort succeeded in depriving her of the exclusive right of protection of other nations, so that some states, Genoa for instance, had the option of English or French

protection. In 1718 Austria got permission for Genoa and Leghorn to use her flag. The smaller states were for a long time glad to secure the protection of one of the strong Powers.

Perhaps no concession made by the Capitulations to foreign powers has been more abused than the grant of this right of protection. We are all indebted to M. Francis Rey for the thorough study he has made of this subject, and I borrow mainly from him the statements which follow.¹ The French, English and Romans seem to have been especially guilty of abuses of the privilege of taking foreigners under their protection. They sold to native Greeks and Armenians the privilege of protection by a document which exempted them from paying duties on goods imported. Many of these became rich by this advantage, and were allowed to make a transfer of their privilege for a consideration. Ambassadors were allowed to have a large number of dragomans, to each of whom they gave a *barat*, which secured for them valuable exemptions. The ambassadors came to dispose of these appointments or barats for sums ranging from 2500 to 4000 piasters. One of the French ambassadors, it is stated in an official report, received more than 400,000 francs from this source. The English ambassador is said to have received £2000 to £3000 income from the same source. The ambassadors presumed to bestow this barat for life. They used to bribe officials even in the Sultan's household. They went so far as to issue patents of protection to whole families of Greek or Armenian subjects of the Sultan.

Russia and Austria shamefully abused this right of protection for political ends. Rivals in seeking influence in Moldavia and Wallachia in 1780 and 1782, their consuls competed with each other in gratuitously granting patents of protection to the natives. At the close of the last century Austria had by this process more than 200,000 subjects in Moldavia, and 60,000 in Wallachia. But these last were afterwards made Russians by changing the patents, when the Russian influence became preponderant in Wallachia.

In 1806 in order to embarrass Russia Napoleon put an end to the abuse by French ambassadors of the right of issuing the barat to any persons but the dragomans. And Turkey succeeded in persuading most of the foreign Powers to imitate his example. But this did not prevent Russia and Austria and Great Britain, through their consuls, taking large numbers of Turkish rajas under their protection by one pretence or another. In 1808 it is said that Russia had 120,000 Greek subjects of the Sultan, Austria a large number

¹ *La Protection Diplomatique et Consulaire dans les Échelles du Levant et de Barbarie*, par Francis Rey. Paris, 1899.

of Dalmatians and Croats, and Great Britain many Indians and Maltese registered as their *protégés*. Of course they formed lawless crowds claiming exemption from police supervision. Some of the *protégés* were rich merchants, whose acts caused diplomatic conflicts. It is not strange, therefore, that in 1869 the Sultan issued an *iradé* forbidding the naturalization of his subjects under a foreign government unless they had previously obtained his consent. Surely he had been imposed on long enough.

The treaties of this century between Turkey and western Powers are all based on the Capitulations, notably those of 1740. Of late years some important changes have been made. The most noteworthy are these: Down to the nineteenth century foreigners could not hold real property except under borrowed names. Since 1867 they have been allowed to hold it. Duties on imports were formerly only three per cent. Now they are eight per cent., but can be raised only by treaty. Since 1868 the inviolability of the domicile of a foreigner is limited to residences within nine hours' journey of a consular post. Questions of real property are determined in an Ottoman court. Religious freedom is confirmed in all the treaties.

Naturally enough Turkey has made repeated efforts to annul the Capitulations. She tried to do this at the Paris Congress of 1856, and again in 1862. But the Powers generally have been unwilling to yield to her desire. Germany, whose policy for some years has been to secure the favor of the Sultan, renounced the Capitulations ten years ago, but under the most favored nation clause in her treaties retains the same privileges as others.

All the Powers except the United States have surrendered in large degree their extraterritorial jurisdiction over their subjects, though the consul of the subject accused of crime attends his trial, and if injustice is threatened, his case is made a matter of diplomatic consideration.

Our insistence on extraterritorial jurisdiction over our citizens accused of crime now results in the miscarriage of justice. For the Turkish government declines to furnish witnesses, and allows the culprit to escape. It maintains that we have no right to exercise the jurisdiction we claim. It affirms that our copy of the treaty is not correct. There is great need of the adjustment of the question by the negotiation of a new treaty.

We have also a constant source of difficulty with Turkey in respect to naturalized Armenians. Many come to this country and take our naturalization papers and return home as American citizens. But the Sultan recognizes no naturalization since 1869, unless it

has been made by his consent. The British avoid the trouble we have by declaring in writing on the passport of every Turkish subject naturalized in Great Britain that it is not valid on return of the bearer to Turkey.¹

Until the government of Turkey undergoes important improvements, and especially until justice is more impartially administered by her courts, it will not be prudent for the western Powers to make exactly such treaties with her as they may properly make with each other. The difference between the customs and laws of the Mohammedan nations on the one hand and those of the Christian nations on the other is so marked that the relations between the two must long be determined by treaties breathing something of the spirit of the old Capitulations.

JAMES B. ANGELL.

¹ This is in accordance with the following provision in the British Naturalization Act of 1870. "An alien to whom a certificate of naturalization is granted . . . shall not, within the limits of the foreign state of which he was a subject previously to obtaining his certificate of naturalization, be deemed to be a British subject unless he has ceased to be a subject of that state in pursuance of the laws thereof, or in pursuance of a treaty to that effect."

NOMINATIONS IN COLONIAL NEW YORK

For the origin of the nominating convention it is necessary to go back to the period which marks the rise of democracy itself—that is, the eighteenth century. The period, that is, which marks the transition from absolutism or aristocracy to democracy will mark also the transition from absolutist or autocratic methods of nomination to democratic methods. In New York this transition was made from a virtual aristocracy to a democracy in the middle and last half of the eighteenth century. It will be necessary therefore to answer the following questions: (1) What were the vital elements in the political life of New York province in the early eighteenth century, and how were nominations made then? (2) When did the transition from aristocracy to democracy begin, and what indications are there of a new method in nominations accompanying this change? (3) To what extent did the new method displace the old before the Revolution?

In 1700 New York was a royal province. Its governmental organization consisted of a governor with his deputy, advised by a council of his own appointment, and a popular assembly which was co-ordinate with the governor and council in legislation. There were established courts of justice and various crown officers besides the governor. But the vital fact in the political history of New York in the early eighteenth century was not the governor, or the council, or the assembly,—was not the organization of the government at all; the vital fact was the existence of a few rich and influential families. Their wealth was based on land and commerce; their influence was the result of ability, social position, and a close organization secured informally by constant, far-sighted, prudential inter-marriages. In other words New York was controlled by an aristocracy of wealth and ability, and this control was essentially medieval in its nature—that is, informal and personal. Let us see in more detail how this control was effected, and how, as a part of this control, nominations to elective offices were made.

In the first place, the theatre of operations was small, there were originally but twelve counties¹ covering a narrow strip of

¹ *Colonial Laws of New York* (Albany, 1894), I. 121, 122; *Memorial History of New York*, I. 408. Ostrander, *Brooklyn*, 118.

territory on both sides of the Hudson, and Long Island and Staten Island. The number of counties increased with the population, but they were mostly cut out of the old ones, so that by the time of the Revolution New York, territorially, was practically what it had been at the opening of the century.

But New York was not only territorially small ; more important still, what there was of it was largely in the hands of a few men who had benefited by the surviving medieval custom of making large land-grants for personal services. In nearly every county some representative of the coterie of great families held considerable tracts of land and helped to carry out a more or less concerted plan of action. On Staten and Long Island few extensive grants were made during the English period ; but even here the most favored ones were men influential in political life—frequently men, such as Smith and Nicolls, whose chief interests were elsewhere.¹ The wealth of the influential families of New York City and County was based upon industry and commerce rather than upon land, though here too some valuable though comparatively small grants were made. New York was nevertheless pre-eminently a commercial city² and the families which were eminent socially and politically make up the roll of her most famous merchant houses. George and Caleb Heathcote, William Smith and William Smith, Jr., the Crugers, one branch of the Livingston family, the Waltons, Alsops, Van Dams,—these were some of the principal merchant families of New York City, and these are names constantly met with in the political history of the province.

But it was northward along the Hudson that the great landed families lived and exercised an influence which was not limited by their own broad estates, but extended throughout the province and was especially powerful in the metropolis, with whose prominent families they were united by ties of interest or of blood-relationship. The largest part of Westchester County was comprised within the six manors located there ; and in 1769 it is estimated that at least five-sixths of the inhabitants of the county lived within their bounds.³ In Dutchess County large grants were made to Philipse, Heathcote, Beekman, and Schuyler.⁴ In Albany County the Livingston manor spread over seven modern townships, and the great Van Rensselaer

¹ Bayle's *Suffolk*, 197, 226.

² "New York probably carries a more extensive commerce than any [other] town in the English American provinces." Kalm, *Description of the City of New York in the year 1748*, in *Manual of the Corporation* (1869), 845.

³ De Lancey, *Origin and History of Manors in New York*, in Scharf's *History of Westchester County*, I. 91.

⁴ Smith, *Dutchess County*, 43, 44.

manor stretched twenty-four by twenty-eight miles along the Hudson, while still farther north on the Mohawk were the possessions of Sir William Johnson, whose influence was perhaps greatest of all.¹

The above brief summary will serve to indicate the chief families composing the New York aristocracy of wealth and ability. An extraordinary proportion of the wealth—especially the landed wealth—of the province was in their possession, and of the social position and political influence incidental to such possession they made good use—so good indeed, that their names mark every page of New York history in the first three-quarters of the eighteenth century. How, then, was this aristocracy organized for purposes of political control?

It was organized, according to the wont of aristocracies, informally, by as wide intermarriages as possible. Each man had an "interest" great or small. If he wished to increase it, it was well to have a large family and contrive to make marriage alliances with as many and important families as possible. The family and the family welfare, socially and politically, was the standard. Thus—to note only a few of the most striking examples—the De Peysters were united with the Alexander,² the Van Cortlandt,³ the Schuyler,⁴ and the Livingston⁵ families. The Heathcotes were allied to the Smith⁶ and the De Lancey families,⁷ and through the De Lancey family to the Philipse,⁸ Van Cortlandt,⁹ Schuyler,¹⁰ and Morris¹¹ families. The Livingstons married into the Van Brugh¹² and Duane¹³ families, and were united with the De Peyster¹⁴ and the

¹ Kip, *Olden Time*, 12, 13. For a map showing exact location of landgrants and manors in New York, see *Documentary History of New York* (1849), I.

² Valentine's *Manual* (1857), 556.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Indeed there were few prominent families of the province who were not related in some way to the De Peyster family. At the funeral of Abram De Peyster, Jr., whose death occurred in 1767, the following families were represented among the relatives of the deceased: Van Cortlandt, Beekman, Bancker, Rutgers, Bedlow, Livingston, De Lancey, De La Noy, Lott, Walton, Cruger, Bayard, Clarkson, Van Horne, Philipse, Schuyler, Stuyvesant, Jay, Roosevelt, etc. *Ibid.*

⁶ Valentine's *Manual* (1864), 665. Caleb Heathcote married the daughter of Chief Justice William Smith.

⁷ By the marriage of Anne Heathcote to James De Lancey. *Ibid.*

⁸ Scharf, *Westchester County*, I. 169.

⁹ Valentine, *History of New York*, 243-244.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Memorial History of New York*, IV. 522, 523.

¹³ *Ibid.*, II. 436 n.

¹⁴ Valentine's *Manual* (1861), 556.

Schuyler¹ families; and more or less closely, therefore, with the connections of these.²

Under such circumstances it is clear that any man of ability who had extended his "interest" judiciously might easily come to have a controlling influence within a faction or a party. A kind of feudal hierarchy would be formed. Having attached to his "interest" a number of the most important families, he would secure through each of them a number of others perhaps less important, and so on down. He would have his machine organized on a personal family basis, rather than on an impersonal "spoils" basis, though the spoils element might not be entirely wanting. Practically this is what happened in New York in the eighteenth century. After some fifty years of intermarriage and political control, two families emerged, each with its following, as the leaders in the struggle which was, though political in some degree, after all very largely personal in its nature. These were the Livingston and De Lancey families;³ and that the struggle was personal rather than political is indicated by the fact that the parties were known by the names of their respective leaders.⁴

So much for a landed and commercial aristocracy and its close personal organization; what were some of the conditions in New York which made easy the political control which it exercised? These were: a limited suffrage; infrequent and irregular elections; a small voting population, the relation of a portion of it to the aristocracy, and the manner of voting; general political indifference among the lower classes.

The franchise was limited to freeholders, and to freemen of the

¹ *Memorial History of New York*, IV. 522, 523.

² This far-reaching and complex network of family relationships among the aristocracy has often been noted. "For more than a century these families retained their position, and directed the infant colony. They formed a coterie of their own, and generation after generation married among themselves." Kip, *Olden Time*, 14, 15; *Memorial History of New York*, II. 604 ff; De Lancey, *Origin and History of Manors*, in Scharf's *History of Westchester County*, I. 130. The best notion of the political significance of these intermarriages may be gathered from the letters of Cadwallader Colden. See *Colden Letter-Book*, I. 362, 363, 459, 468, II. 68, 167, 168, 223, 224, 398, 399: in *New York Historical Society Collections*, Fund Series, IX., X.

³ Dawson, *Westchester County during the American Revolution*, 89. *Memorial History of New York*, II. 223, 570. *Colden Letter-Book*, II. 223, 224. No single man in New York had greater influence, perhaps, than Sir William Johnson; but his influence was due rather to other causes, and he seems to have held somewhat aloof from the partisan strife of the Livingstons and the De Lanceys.

⁴ "It may gratify the reader to know that of the members of the Assembly (1752), Mr. Chief Justice De Lancey was nephew to Colonel Beekman, brother to Peter De Lancey, brother-in-law to John Watts, cousin to Philip Verplanck and John Baptist Van Rensselaer; . . . of the whole house the only member neither connected with Mr. De Lancey nor within the sphere of his influence was Mr. Livingston." Smith, *History of New York*, II. 142, 143.

corporations.¹ The elections were held whenever the assembly was dissolved, sometimes at such short notice that the total voting population, such as it was, could not be got to the polls.² But the whole voting population, on account of the limitations of the suffrage, was small. In 1790 the proportion of voters for assemblymen to the total population was approximately twelve per cent.³ Using this as a percentage previous to the Revolution the voting population increased from 2,168 in 1698 to 20,256 in 1771.⁴ This is a liberal estimate too, because the percentage of people of African birth was less in 1791 than during the pre-revolutionary period.⁵ But even so, the voting population was small and therefore proportionately easy to manage. A voting population of from two to twenty thousand, scattered over twelve counties, gave no great difficulty to an aristocracy as coherent and well organized as that of New York province. And this was made easier still by the personal relation of the aristocracy to a portion of the voting population, and by the method of voting. That tenant voters would be largely influenced by lords of manors is perhaps sufficiently obvious. The method of voting, too, contributed to the same end. It was

¹ "Every freeholder within the province and free man in any corporation shall have his free choice and vote in the election of the representatives." *Colonial Laws of New York*, I. iii. Freeholders were defined, by the act of May 16, 1699, to be those who "have lands or tenements improved to the value of forty pounds in freehold free from all incumbrance and have possessed the same three months before the test of the said writ." *Colonial Laws of New York*, I. 405. Quoted in Dawson's *Westchester County during the American Revolution*, 4, note 3. The date given by Dawson is May 8, 1699. Freemen of the New York Corporation were such as had permission to "use any art, trade, mystery, or manual occupation," within the city save in "times of Faires." Extract from Dongan's Charter, April 20, 1686, quoted in *The Burghers of New Amsterdam and the Freemen of New York, 1675-1866*, in *New York Historical Society Collections*, 1885, p. 48. By this charter such persons were to pay, if merchant traders or shop-keepers, three pounds, twelve shillings; if handicraftsmen, one pound, four shillings. *Ibid.*, 49. But at the Common Council for April 24, 1686, the "fee for freedoms" was made five pounds. *Ibid.*, 48. This seems to have been the law until 1784 when a slight modification was made. *Ibid.*, 239, 240. For the list of freemen admitted in New York City from 1686 to 1776, see *ibid.*, 53-238.

Besides the counties, the manors of Rensselaerwick, Livingston, and Cortlandt, and the borough of Westchester, enjoyed the privilege of sending representatives.

² "As to the present election it was appointed so suddenly by the sheriff that it was impossible to collect the votes of this extensive county, particularly as the roads are so bad and the rivers impassable." William Johnson to Dr. Auchmuty, Jan. 25, 1769. Johnson's MSS., XVII. 51.

³ Based upon "a census of the electors and inhabitants of the State of New York taken in the year 1790." (Broadside in the Library of the New York Historical Society, Vol. I. of the collection) and a "List of electors in New York state for the assembly, reported by a committee of the House, Jan. 27, 1791." (*Greenleaf's Journal*, Jan. 27, 1791.)

⁴ This estimate is made on the basis of statistics presented in the *Documentary History of New York* (1849), I. 689-697.

⁵ *Ibid.*

throughout *viva voce*; every man voted in full knowledge of the candidates and of the powerful leaders.¹ A voter could not be independent in secret; by his vote he proclaimed to the world in whose "interest" he stood. Every voter was watched, we may be sure, and his record was known.² In addition to this the widespread political indifference among the common people, in the rural districts at least, made political control by the aristocracy still more easy.³

By whom, then, and how were nominations made as a part of this political control? They were made practically by the controlling members of the aristocracy, informally and personally. Strictly speaking there was no *method*—nominations were methodless. This assertion rests largely on a lack of evidence rather than on a wealth of it. The very fact that there is scarcely any evidence left to us of how nominations were made tends to show that there was no formal method—tends to show in the light of the conditions just enumerated, that candidates were "set up" by some form of private personal agreement among the two or three men within a county whose "interests" were sufficient to decide the election. Their stand once taken, all who were in their "interest" followed their lead as a matter of course, for this is the essence of the aristocratic method, that men are governed by personality rather than by principle. The question in Albany was not, what are the candidate's principles, but whom is Sir William or Col. Livingston for?

But although the lack of evidence tends to show that this was true because this fashion of selecting candidates, above all others, would leave little trace save in private correspondence, what evidence there is tends to confirm it; and that little is to be gleaned from such correspondence. What has been said of the old aristo-

¹ The method of taking a poll is detailed by the law of May 16, 1699, *Colonial Laws of New York*, I. 406 ff. See also De Lancey, *Manors of New York*, in Scharf's *History of Westchester County*, I. 110. The best notion of what a colonial election was like can be obtained from a description of the election of Lewis Morris to the Assembly from Westchester County in 1733. *New York Journal*, Nov. 5, 1733; quoted in Bolton, *History of Westchester County*, I. 136-139; and given in substance in the *Memorial History of New York*, II. 233.

² A wealthy and influential member of the aristocracy could be opposed by a common man only with some temerity. The view taken of such opposition is well illustrated in the closing lines of the description of the election of Lewis Morris in 1733. "Upon the closing of the poll, the other candidate, Forster, and the Sheriff, wished the late Chief Justice much joy. Forster said he hoped the late judge would not think the worse of him for setting up against him, to which the judge replied, he believed he was put up against his inclinations, but that he was highly blameable." *New York Journal*, Nov. 5, 1733.

³ Dawson, *Westchester County during the American Revolution*, 1, ff. Clute, *Staten Island*, 82.

cratic method of making nominations can readily and most fitly be illustrated by extracts taken from the manuscript letters and papers of Sir William Johnson.¹

In May, 1745, the Assembly was dissolved for lack of respect to the governor,² and in the election which followed the services of Sir William were enlisted by the governor, who wished a certain Mr. Holland returned for Schenectady.³ Not long after we find Mr. Holland himself soliciting the aid of his patron thus:⁴ "there is a barrell of the flour wanting, which I suppose Peter left behind him. Your interest in the [ensu]ing election at Schenectady for a representative is desired for your [frie]nd and servt. . . E. H."

Three years later another election occurred. In such a county as Albany the centre of political activity was naturally at the city of Albany, and most of the candidates came from there. That this was often a ground of complaint by outlying districts we may well believe. In this election of 1748 indeed the farmers of Canajoharie were up in arms, threatening to set up a candidate of their own. The following document will explain how the matter was settled through the influence of Johnson.⁵

"Messers.

"Considering how troublesome and inconvenient it would be to all the farmers to have an election at this time of the year, I went immediately to Albany to see to make it up easy now without any trouble. Philip Schuyler and Hans Hansen were sett up by the people of Albany, so I sent for them, and told them if they would do their best for the government of the country we would not sett up anybody against them now, but if they would not do good now for the country we would set up others next time, whereupon they promised me they would do what they could. . . . Now gentlemen and friends I thank you all heartily for your good will for me, as well as if you had voted every bit. I hope when there is another election you will be all as one body to stand by me and put in other good men if these wont do good for us now. For my part I am resolved as I live here to stand by you all for the good of the whole

¹ Sir William Johnson was one of the most influential members of the New York aristocracy. His influence in the northern counties was especially great. On this point see a letter from the Revolutionary committee of the Palatine District of Tryon County, May 18, 1775, *American Archives*, fourth series, II. 637; and Campbell's *Tryon County*, 29.

The letters and papers of Sir William Johnson in twenty-six volumes are in the State Library at Albany. They have been calendared and indexed. Vols. I.-XXII. contain letters and papers arranged chronologically from 1738 to 1774. Vols. XXIII.-XXV. contain letters and papers arranged chronologically from 1733 to 1775. Vol. XXVI. contains private business papers. I am indebted to the courtesy of the head of the Manuscript Department of the State Library for the use of these papers.

² Stone, *Life of Sir William Johnson*, I. 157.

³ *Ibid.*, 188.

⁴ E. H. to Sir William Johnson, June 7, 1745. Johnson MSS., XXIII. 11.

⁵ Johnson MSS., XXIII. 78. This document is in the handwriting of Johnson.

river and hope we will always be true to one another. I am with hearty thanks for all your good will, your true friend and well wisher.

W. J.

To all the Messers of Canajoharie."

This document speaks with no uncertain note of the personal influence of Sir William, at least over the farmers of Canajoharie. But his influence, as we shall see, was not limited to the Mohawk region: it was almost if not quite as great in other parts of the county, and even in the city of Albany itself his name was one to conjure with. "It may easily be seen," writes a correspondent from Albany two years later,¹ "that the intention of the heads here in general are (*sic*) for putting in Coll: Schuyler and Peter Winne, who with their party here work very hard from morning till night and Mr. Collins sends letters to all parts of the county. Mr. De Peyster is very diligent—wether for himself or others is yet a secret to your friends who long to see you here and say if you appeared it would make a great alteration for they confess it is in our power to turn the skeals if you take it in hand."

Factional contests became increasingly sharp towards the time of the Revolution: as early as 1761 competition for the assembly-seat in Albany County had become keen and a number of men were ready to set themselves up. For most of them it seemed desirable, for some it seemed essential, to get the support of Sir William Johnson. The old members, we are told,¹ "propose to advertise themselves this day without the advise of any one of the citizens." But although they may have ignored the magnates of Albany, it does not appear that they found it wise altogether to neglect Johnson. On the same day we find one of them, at least, seeking his aid for the office.² "As the gentlemen here in town propose to set us up for Representatives for the city and County of Albany, and if its agreeable to you we beg your Interest, in which you'll very much oblige us. We remain respectfully, sir," etc.³ A third party determined to run Abraham Yates, the late sheriff, who was, they assured Sir William, "a very good man," and was likely to have "a pretty strong interest," but, "nevertheless we should be glad to know your Inclinations, as we are certain they would be supported by both the manors of Rensselaer and Livingston."⁴

The next election—the last but one in the colonial period—came

¹ Richard Miller to William Johnson, July 3, 1750. Johnson MSS, XXIII. 121.

² David Van der Heyden to William Johnson, Feb. 3, 1761. Johnson MSS., V. 38. The old members were Jacob Ten Eyck and Peter Winne.

³ Jacob Ten Eyck and Volckert P. Douw to William Johnson, Feb. 3, 1761. *Ibid.*, 37.

⁴ David Van der Heyden to William Johnson, Feb. 3, 1761. *Ibid.*, 38.

in the spring of 1768.¹ James Butler, a friend of Sir William's, kept the latter informed of the various candidates. But most people, he writes,² "believe that those you [des]ire will carry the point: there are some that are very faint-hearted, knowing your Interest to be too great for their [strength]." Early in January the report got abroad that Sir William intended to set up a candidate of his own from the Mohawk district—a report which created some consternation at Albany, and occasioned many conjectures and many meetings. The common opinion was that Sir John Johnson must be the intended candidate. For the friends of Sir William, who were constantly urging him to active conflict with the Albany faction, this was good news. "If there is any such intention," writes Cartwright, from Albany,³ "should be very glad to know it. You may depend on the Interest of Cuyler's family, of Hanson's, and many more, who would be glad to know it. Whatever Interest or connection I have you may command in that or anything else." But the rumor was merely a rumor, for we are told that neither "myself nor Sir John had the least thought of his setting up;" but Sir William, nevertheless, had "some reason to think that I could have carried the county without much difficulty."⁴

The last election in New York province came the next year, 1769, and was for the most part only a continuation of the struggle begun the year before. No previous elections were more bitterly contested.⁵ In Albany, as in most places, the personal element was

¹ Meanwhile between the elections of 1761 and 1768 Johnson received a letter from Schenectady, which throws interesting light on the method, or lack of method, in nominations, which prevailed at that time. "I have been thinking on what has for some time passed been advised, which is that I should become a candidate to represent the township in Assembly whenever a vacancy happened, and as my becoming a member . . . might be a means to settle all party affairs here, I shall . . . have no objection in so doing, provided you approve and will favor me with your Interest . . . otherwise I will think no more of it . . . on the other hand, if you think it right I will endeavor with my other friends to make what Interest I can . . . although I am sensible that your Interest alone can do it." John Duncan to William Johnson, Nov. 19, 1763. Johnson MSS., VII. 252.

² James Butler to William Johnson, Dec. 12, 1767. Johnson MSS., XV. 173.

³ Benjamin Cartwright to William Johnson, Jan. 8, 1768. Johnson MSS., XV. 228.

⁴ William Johnson to Hugh Wallace, April 8, 1768. Johnson MSS., XVI. 66.

⁵ The new issues which were coming to the front were cutting into the old factions and separating families long connected by political and social ties. The rupture between the Colden and Clinton families is an example. There is an interesting letter among the George Clinton papers, from the young Cadwallader Colden to George Clinton, relative to this rupture, which throws so much light on the political methods of the time that it is worth reproducing at length.

"Coldingham, Jan. 11, 1769.

"Sir. The heats and animosities created by the last election in this part of the county (and that too among the most intimate acquaintances . . .) gave me such concern that I can't but say that I am truly sorry there is now an opportunity for the renew-

still predominant. Philip Schuyler, one of the old members, owed his position, partially at least, to the interest of Johnson, whose support he had asked at former elections,¹ and his re-election now depended not upon his attitude toward current political questions, but upon his personal relations with Sir William. "I assure you," writes Hugh Wallace,² "this gentleman behaved very badly here, and I am told spoke of you at the Indian Congress with some disrespect. I got into his company and introduced a discourse about that affair, but his tone was different or, by God, his bones would have paid for it. I think you ought to exert your Interest that he should not be returned." The zealous partisan of Sir William goes on to suggest that Sir John be returned in Schuyler's stead, not because Sir John was a fitter man, but because "it would give great pleasure to many of your sincere friends ;" at any rate, "as you have it in your power to send who (*sic*) you please for Albany county, I wish you would stop Coll : Schuyler, and I think you might send a fitter man than poor Myndertse for Schenectady." Johnson replied to Wallace on January 25, stating that he had only recently heard of the "particular you mention with regard to Philip Schuyler." Since then he had received a polite note from Schuyler and the other candidate "requesting my interest again, on which I immediately wrote him as I ought with regard to the report I had heard which he has denied or endeavored to explain away. However I think it necessary to take

ing or continuing those fermentations. . . . I cant question you, for your part, being a ready to promote any scheme that may have a tendency to unite this end of the county again and to restore that friendship that has so long subsisted between you and my father's family ; and I see but one way at present likely to bring this about ; and that is to think of a third person for candidate for this end of the county who was not mentioned in the last election, and consequently not of either party, and such a one there happens to be even within the county,—Mr. Peter Du Bois. Perhaps this will appear to be your son's forsaking his friends and the party he joined at the other end of the county. I cant think this objection of sufficient weight when it is considered that Mr. Du Bois (if of any) must be of the same party. Besides I should leave the people of this end of the county entirely to themselves with regard to the choice of the other member. As a lover of peace and concord I now offer these things to your consideration. I am sensible that it is as little for the private benefit of your son to be in the assembly as it would be for me, and therefore if the influence which one or two gentlemen in New York has over him is such as to put a reconciliation with me out of the question I shall then ever know what to depend upon and perhaps things may take a different turn from what he expects. . . . A little reflection, I think, must induce you to use your influence with your son to comply with [these] proposals. The weight they have with you and him will ever after determine how much I shall be, Sir,

Your Humble Serv't,
CAD' COLDEN JUNR."

George Clinton Papers, I. 11.

¹William Johnson to the Rev. Dr. Auchmuty, Jan. 25, 1769. Johnson MSS., XVII. 51.

²Hugh Wallace to William Johnson, Jan. 7, 1769. *Ibid.*, 32.

the first opportunity of a personal explanation as he writes in such a manner that *it would not be altogether justifiable in me to condemn him at once.*"¹ Unless this is an exaggerated account of Sir William's influence—and it very likely is to some extent—he seems to have had as sure a grip on Albany County as any modern boss could well have. The difference lies here: the personal influence of a modern boss is secret, working through an open formal organization, and based upon the control of the spoils; the personal influence of Sir William was open, working through a private informal organization, and based to a very considerable extent upon personal attachment. Sir William was not a boss, he was a patron.

If this serves to show what the nature of the aristocratic method of nomination was, it also indicates to what extent this method prevailed down to the Revolution. It is now necessary to retrace our steps and search for the beginnings of the democratic method.

The period from 1730 to 1750 in New York discovers a marked advance in material prosperity and in scientific and literary activity; it is in some senses a renaissance period, having its basis in a growing democratic spirit, a coming consciousness of equality.² It is here we must look for the origin of the nominating convention, which is an incident in the growth of this democratic spirit. The nominating convention is an incident in

¹ William Johnson to Hugh Wallace, January 25, 1769. Johnson MSS., XVII. 52. The same sentiments are expressed in a letter to John Watts, January 26, 1769. *Ibid.*, 56; and in a letter to the Rev. Dr. Auchmuty, who must have made a similar request, he says, "As to the person you particularly mention, he applied to me at his first entrance into the House, and as I had nothing then to urge against him, I made no stir, nor had he any opponents. If his conduct since will justify me, I shall at another opportunity do what is needful, as I have the pleasure to find that conduct which gives me inward satisfaction has produced me an Influence and Interest in this country which it is not in their power to deprive me of." William Johnson to Dr. Auchmuty, January 25, 1769. *Ibid.*, 51. For a more complete account of the trouble between Johnson and Schuyler, see the letter from John Wetherhead to William Johnson. January 9, 1769. *Ibid.*, XXV. 125.

² Judge Jones in his history calls 1750 the golden age in New York and all modern writers have agreed in ascribing to this period a decided intellectual activity, compared, at least, with what preceded. See *Memorial History of New York*, II. 230, 448 ff. 631, 632; III. 115. To be convinced that it was a period of growing democratic consciousness it is only necessary to look through the newspapers and broadsides of the time, and follow through the political discussions which arose, remembering always that this was the logical outcome of the previous years of conflict between the lower house and the governors—between the representatives of the people in the colony and the representatives of the government in England. For example, a broadside, dated September 28, 1736, says, relative to the Van Dam-Clarke controversy, "Every freeman has a right to declare who is entitled to the government and it is no crime in a free one, though it may be in France or Spain. . . . Let every man declare boldly who he thinks entitled, Van Dam or Clarke, and the Corporation it is supposed will act according to the directions of their constituents." Vol. I., of a collection of broadsides in the Library of the New York Historical Society. See other broadsides in the same collection.

the effort of the masses to pull down authority from the top and place it on the ground—an instrument by which they try to get vital control of the business of governing. One thing which aided them in this effort—which was in truth partially the result of it, but which in turn reacted upon it and powerfully confirmed it—was the establishment of newspapers, the extension of printing generally, and the consequent struggle for freedom of speech and the press.¹ In the face of this growing democratic spirit, the very essence of which is individual initiative, the great families found their influence growing weaker, found it less possible to hold a following by mere force of personality. As men came more and more to have opinions of their own and to express them through the newspapers and broadsides, or at least imbibed such opinion as others were thus expressing, the leaders found it increasingly necessary to win over their "Interests" to every measure and every ticket, by force of reason, or what passed for reason, rather than by force of personality. This is simply saying that when men learn that they may have opinions on political questions with *reasons* for them, some broadly generalized theory of political right, or governmental policy, or social change, instead of some powerful personality, will claim their allegiance. This was happening in New York during the middle and last half of the eighteenth century, and the change was followed there as everywhere by the disintegration of old followings, the increase of factions, general political heterodoxy. The old leaders therefore found themselves increasingly under the necessity of extending their influence and harmonizing thought and action, not merely over the field of a narrow oligarchic aristocracy, each member of which was sure of his own following, but over the whole field of those who were politically interested. Marriage alliances, which had been the means for effecting the informal personal organization of the aristocratic period, were no longer efficient or practicable; one could not marry the whole world, and, besides, marriage was a personal bond only; marrying into a man's family did not mean marrying into his principles, much less the principles of all of the members of that family. The thing that had to be done therefore was this: this growing anarchy of opinion, of individual initiation, had to be harmonized, organized, centralized in a formal and public manner on the basis of principle, instead of, as formerly,

¹ Printing was first introduced into New York in 1693 by William Bradford. He also established the first newspaper in New York, the *New York Gazette*, which dates from the fall of 1725. Of more importance in this connection was the establishment of Zenger's *New York Journal*, in 1733, as the avowed organ of the popular party. Popular sentiments were freely expressed in this somewhat rabid sheet, and in numerous broadsides which Zenger made a business of printing and circulating.

in a personal private manner on the basis of leadership. Practically we find just this thing happening in New York at this time—the beginnings of the association of individuals, in a more or less public manner, with little in common but their political views, and with no other aim than the accomplishment of a definite political purpose.

I shall now try to illustrate the beginnings of this new method in the period before the Revolution. That these beginnings should be more marked in the cities than in the country, needs, perhaps, no explanation.

As early as 1739 the reeholders and freemen of New York City were informed that "Whereas a great number of the freeholders and freemen of the said city have agreed and resolved to choose the following persons to represent them, to wit: [four names follow]. Your vote and interest are desired . . . at the ensuing election."¹ Though this does not necessarily imply an actual meeting of a formal nature, it does imply an agreement of some sort, and, what is more important, indicates the growing authority of common men in such matters when acting jointly. Likewise at the election of 1743 "a great number of inhabitants," we are told, agreed in a similar manner to support a certain ticket.² Notices of a like nature became more common at the succeeding elections.³

At this time too the practice of writing letters and addresses to the freeholders and publishing them in the newspapers and in broadsides became common. In these addresses the issues were discussed more or less intelligently, the candidates criticized, and information freely given as to the rights of citizens, the duties of legislators and the qualities which it was desirable that public servants should have.⁴ In all of these can be clearly seen the tendency toward organization in a more formal way and on the basis of common political notions.

¹ The *New York Gazette*, Feb. 20-27, 1739. Copied in Valentine's *Manual of the Corporation* (1865), 744.

² Valentine's *Manual* (1865), 751.

³ *New York Post Boy*, Dec. 21, 1747; Valentine's *Manual* (1865), 821; *New York Gazette*, July 30, 1850; Valentine's *Manual* (1866), 643, 697. An amusing squib, entitled, "Political Bill of Mortality," taken from the papers of William Livingston, is printed by Sedgwick in his *Memoir of the Life of William Livingston* (1833), 65. It states that in the month of August, 1750, there were in all 110 political deaths in New York City, three dying "of nocturnal consultations," fourteen "of running about for votes," etc.

⁴ These addresses are too long to be reproduced in full. The *New York Gazette* of Jan. 18, 1748, contains one of three columns, signed, "Freeholder." The author argues against the present members, whom, he finds, it is intended to return. A reply is printed in the same paper, Jan. 25, in which the present members are supported. Such communications become more and more frequent from 1750. Newspapers and broadsides constituted, so to say, the forum of political discussion.

A little later there are some indications of half-clandestine meetings in the nature of caucuses. At first the evidence of these meetings comes in the form of ridicule and burlesque—an indication probably that they had not been at all recent before.¹ In spite of ridicule, however, these meetings tended necessarily to become more frequent and to take on more and more an open and public character. This need for formal organization found expression also in the foundation of the "Whig Club" in 1752, under the direction of the leaders of the Livingston party.² The club was composed of William Livingston, William Smith, Jr., and John Morin Scott. They met "once in each week at the popular tavern of the King's Arms," and, we may imagine, served as well as possible the purposes for which county and state central committees now exist. Passing over much that would serve still further to illustrate the growing publicity and the tendency toward formal organization in methods of nomination, it will be sufficient perhaps to indicate the stage which had been reached in this development at the last formal elections in 1768 and 1769.

By 1768 the practice of self-nomination had already begun to excite adverse comment;³ for self-nomination was a survival of the old system in that it implied a more or less private and secret agreement behind. It was now passing away as these private agreements were changing into formal public meetings which did their own nominating. By this time, too, the publication of long and elaborate letters and addresses in newspapers and handbills, had come to be a firmly established practice,⁴—a practice to which we

¹ See burlesque in *New York Gazette*, Feb. 3, 1752. In same connection see *ibid.*, Feb. 17.

² *Memorial History of New York*, II. 346. The King's Arms Tavern was located on the northeast corner of Broad and Dock (now Pearl) streets, opposite "Black Sam" Fraunces's tavern. The building was destroyed in 1890; the old Fraunces tavern building is still standing.

³ *New York Mercury*, Feb. 15, 22, 1768.

⁴ See broadside entitled, "The Watchman No. 1," in the New York Historical Society library, Vol. I. of the collection. The article is an attack on the De Lancey family and belongs to the year 1768. See also an address to "The Freeholders and Freemen of the City and County of New York" in the same collection. It probably belongs to the election of 1768 or 1769. The author descants on the blessings of representative government, and exhorts the freeholders to choose men of "Sincerity and Probity and Capacity." He would exact from candidates a declaration "that they will not accept any office of honor or profit under the government . . . while they represent you; that they will do all in their power to get an agent appointed at the court of Great Britain . . . At all events choose men of ability and no Boys." See also, same collection, broadside entitled, "To the Citizens of New York on the present critical situation of affairs," etc. The Lenox Library collection of broadsides of this period and later has been conveniently described and summarized in the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, Jan., 1899, pp. 23 ff.

look back for the origin of our present convention platforms. But it was not until the final election in the spring of the next year that the new method clearly assumed its first distinctive form—the formal public mass-meeting; by a glance at this election we may perceive how far the new method had developed before the Revolution.

The questions at issue in both elections were for the most part the same. At bottom was the old Livingston-De Lancey rivalry; on the side of Livingston were ranged the dissenters, the lawyers, and the radical anti-British party, while the Church, the merchants, and the compromisers stood by De Lancey. Nevertheless the old personal rivalries were giving way before the coming life-and-death questions of British control, which were cutting into the old factions and rapidly reorganizing parties on a basis of principle instead of on a basis of leadership. This tendency is clearly to be seen in the election of 1769, at the very time when the new methods in nomination are first coming prominently to the front.

The result of the bitter personal contest of 1768 was the election of one member of the Livingston party, Philip Livingston himself, and three of the De Lancey party, James De Lancey, James Jauncey, and Jacob Walton. As the election of 1769 approached, Livingston determined not to be a candidate at all unless there could be a "peaceful election." With other members of his party, therefore, he addressed a letter to De Lancey and Walton, deploring the religious dissensions and proposing a temporary union of the parties by the nomination of a joint ticket, each party naming two candidates.¹ This proposition was rejected, but on January 4 the De Lancey party held a meeting at the Exchange, where they nominated De Lancey, Jauncey, and Walton, and sent a messenger to Livingston offering to make him the fourth member.² Livingston having declined this proposal, the meeting proceeded to fill out their ticket with the name of John Cruger, the mayor.³ The Livingston party had its meeting the very same day, and notwithstanding Livingston's refusal to stand as a candidate for either party unless a compromise could be arranged, proceeded to form a ticket of which he was the head, the others being Peter V. Livingston, Theodorus Van Wyck, and John Morin Scott.⁴ These meetings, it is related, consisted of some hundreds of inhabitants.⁵ They were of course

¹ Sedgwick, *Memoir of William Livingston*, 146, 147. The statement of Sedgwick is based upon a broadside in the New York Public Library. See also the statement of Philip Livingston, *New York Mercury*, Jan. 9, 1769.

² *Memorial History of New York*, II. 396; *New York Mercury*, Jan. 9, 1769.

³ *New York Mercury*, Jan. 9, 1769.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Memorial History of New York*, II. 396.

mere mass-meetings and unorganized, but the unorganized mass-meeting leads directly to the organized nominating convention.

Thus while the old method, previous to the Revolution, retained its hold rather firmly in the rural districts and the upper counties, the new method had attained its first distinctive form, at least within the city of New York. The Revolution itself gave a powerful impetus to the new method, and practically destroyed the old. It destroyed the old by breaking up and driving out the old aristocracy ; gave a great impetus to the new by teaching a minority the uses of formal organization—mass-meetings, committees, resolutions, chairmanships, and rules of order. When the Revolution was over, and the new elective offices were to be filled, these lessons were not forgotten.

CARL BECKER.

THE LEGEND OF MARCUS WHITMAN

FAMILIAR as the student of history is with the growth of legend, it is frequently assumed that these products of fancy develop only in the absence of documents and contemporary records; or that, if they do invade the field of authenticated history, it is only to clothe the bare limbs of fact with the foliage of picturesque incident or winged words: Columbus stands the egg on its end, or Galileo mutters "*e pur si muove.*" History is full of such touches, which if not true are not essential distortions of the train of events. For examples of the complete legendary reconstruction of history we naturally turn to the Middle Ages or earlier periods, and call to mind the Donation of Constantine or the story of William Tell. That such a reconstruction of history should take place in the latter half of the nineteenth century in the United States and should involve an event of such immense importance and world-wide publicity as the acquisition of Oregon will seem little short of incredible. To trace the steps by which the imaginative reconstruction of this transaction, strangely distorting the relative significance of men and events, has slowly but steadily pushed aside the truth, until it has invaded not only the text-books but the works of historians whose reputation gives their utterances a certain authority, would give every one a new idea of the pervasive and subtle power of the legendary faculty of the human mind and of the need of unceasing critical vigilance.¹

¹ Its first appearance in a formal history was in W. H. Gray's *History of Oregon, 1792-1849, Drawn from Personal Observation and Authentic Information*, Portland, Oregon, 1870. Von Holst mentions it in 1881 (*Const. Hist. of the U. S.*, III. 51, 52), with some hesitation. It is taken from Von Holst by Lyon G. Tyler, *Letters and Times of the Tylers*, Richmond, Va., 1885, II. 439, and presented with some corrective comments. The period of its widest diffusion and general acceptance, however, begins in 1883 with the publication of Barrows's *Oregon*. Thence it has passed into magazine and newspaper articles and text-books. See McMaster's *With the Fathers*, N. Y., 1896, the chapter entitled "The Struggle for Territory," pp. 307-310; McMaster's *School History of the U. S.*, 1897, pp. 32-34; J. W. Foster's *Century of American Diplomacy*, 1900, p. 305; J. W. Burgess's *The Middle Period*, 1897, pp. 314-316; the school histories of Scudder, Thomas, Montgomery, and Gordy, also the *Encycl. Brit.* as well as the American Supplement and *The International Cycl.*, arts. Oregon.

In O. W. Nixon's *How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon*, Chicago, 1895, all the legendary elements are combined with some genuine material, but the author is either ignorant of or suppresses essential facts. Eva Emery Dye's *McLoughlin and Old Oregon*, Chicago, 1900, adds new fictitious materials. This book is hardly more than an

To enable the reader to follow a critical investigation of how Marcus Whitman saved Oregon to the United States, a brief outline of the story must be given.

About the first of October 1842, while Dr. Whitman was dining at a trading-post of the Hudson's Bay Company at Fort Walla Walla the news comes of the arrival of a colony of Canadians from the Red River country. The assembled company is jubilant and a young priest cries out "Hurrah for Oregon! America is too late, and we have got the country." Whitman realizes that if Canadian immigration has really begun the authorities at Washington ought to know it, and a counter American immigration ought to be promoted, so that when the joint occupation of Oregon is terminated, the presence of a majority of American settlers may turn the balance in favor of the United States by right of possession. The government must be informed as to the value of Oregon and its accessibility by overland emigration. In spite of the protests of his fellow missionaries, he immediately starts for Washington, where he arrives March 2, 1843, most opportunely to secure the postponement of negotiations looking to the surrender of Oregon by pledging himself to demonstrate the accessibility of the country by conducting thither a thousand immigrants, which he does during the ensuing summer.¹

The essential points in this statement are the cause and purpose of Dr. Whitman's journey to the East in 1842, his influence on the Oregon policy of the government and his organization of the great immigration of 1843. Incidental or collateral assumptions usually accompany this statement to the effect that great ignorance and indifference in regard to Oregon prevailed in Washington and generally throughout the United States, and that Dr. Whitman was able to dispel the ignorance and to transform the indifference into a deep and widespread interest. In both the essentials and the explanatory details the story of how Marcus Whitman saved Oregon is fictitious. It is not only without trustworthy contemporary evidence, but is irreconcilable with well established facts. No traces of knowledge

historical romance. It is a most curious fact that although Bancroft's *Oregon*, which was published in 1885, contains a well digested and true account of the causes of Whitman's journey and his connection with the emigration of 1843, all carefully authenticated from contemporary sources, it has been entirely neglected by the authors of the books above mentioned.

My eyes were first opened to the intricacies and curious origin of the legend by a very careful investigation conducted under my supervision by one of my students, Mr. Arthur Howard Hutchinson. His study of the question convinced him that there was a larger amount of collusion and purpose in developing and disseminating the story than I have thought it best to try to prove in this article.

¹ Cf. Barrows's *Oregon*, p. 160 ff.; McMaster, *With the Fathers*, pp. 307-310.

of it have ever been found in the contemporary discussion of the Oregon question. The story first emerges over twenty years after the events and seventeen years after Whitman's death and its conception of the Oregon policy of the government is that handed down by tradition in an isolated and remote community. Criticism of a simple type has winnowed out some of the crudest misconceptions, unconscious that more is needed to substantiate a narrative than to sift out its impossibilities.¹

The real cause of Dr. Whitman's journey to the East was the decision of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to discontinue the southern branch of the mission, and his purpose was to secure a reversal of that order, and reinforcements from the Board, and to bring back, if possible, a few Christian families. The rapidly increasing immigration into Oregon made an increase of Protestant missions essential if Oregon was to be saved from becoming Catholic.

Owing to difficulties of the work among the small and widely scattered groups of Indians and to dissensions among the missionaries of the Oregon missions the Prudential Committee of the American Board passed the following resolution, February 23, 1842: "That the Rev. Henry H. Spalding be recalled, with instructions to return by the first direct and suitable opportunity; that Mr. William H. Gray be advised to return home, and also the Rev. Asa B. Smith, on account of the illness of his wife; that Dr. Marcus Whitman and Mr. Cornelius Rogers be designated to the northern branch of the mission; and that the two last named be authorized to dispose of the mission property in the southern branch of the mission."²

This action of the Prudential Committee was discussed at the meeting of the Oregon Mission, September 26, 1842. Mr. Gray requested that he might be released to establish a boarding-school under the auspices of the Hudson's Bay Company's officials, which was refused. On the 28th it was

"*Resolved*: That if arrangements can be made to continue the operations of this station, that Dr. Marcus Whitman be at liberty and advised to visit the United States as soon as practicable to confer with

¹ Cf. Burgess, *The Middle Period*, pp. 315-316, and Eells, *History of Indian Missions*, Philadelphia, 1882. On pp. 43-46, Mr. Eells tells the true history of Whitman's journey East and then on pp. 162-176 the full legendary account, omitting only such details as are obviously irreconcilable with the records of the Board!

² Records of the Prudential Committee of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, at the Congregational House, Boston. Cf. *The Missionary Herald*, Jan. 1843, p. 14, and the *Report* of the A.B.C.F.M. for 1842, p. 194.

the committee of the A.B.C.F.M. in regard to the interests of this mission."¹

E. WALKER, moder.
CUSHING EELLS, Scribe,
H. H. SPALDING."

On October 3, 1842, Mr. Walker wrote to the Board a long letter regarding the work in Oregon, urging them to keep up the missions for the benefit of the incoming white settlers as well as for the Indians for whom they had been established. "With this view of the case," he writes :

"You will see why we were unwilling to abandon the South branch, for as it seemed to us, by giving that up we were giving up the whole mission. Notwithstanding we thought that the object of your letter had been accomplished by the reconciliation which had taken place, still we felt ourselves placed in a trying situation, we hardly knew what course to pursue, but concluded to wait until we could receive an answer to the committee [communication?]² of the mission stating that the difficulties of the mission were settled. We found too that there was a difficulty in sustaining the mission as so many had withdrawn and as the reinforcements had stopped at the Islands [Hawaiian Islands]. After considerable consultation without coming to any definite conclusion and as we were about starting for our place, a proposition was made by Dr. Whitman for him to return to the States this winter to confer with the Prudential Committee and conduct a reinforcement out next summer if it was thought best to continue the mission. At least something definite could be decided upon. The proposition being presented just as we were on the eve of leaving we felt at first that we could not then give a decided answer to it. We wanted him to think and pray over it and proposed we return and send in writing our conclusion. But we were told that there was no time to be lost, that we must decide it now, or it would be too late. After some more consultation, we stated that if the station could be put in a situation which would render it safe to be left and after proper arrangements could be made, we would consent to Dr. Whitman's going to the States. We do not approve of the hasty manner in which this question was decided. Nothing it seemed to us but stern necessity induced us to decide on the manner we did. It seemed death to put the proposition in force and worse than death to remain as we were. I have

¹ From letter-book "Oregon Indians" in the records of the Board. The letter is dated : "Wailatpu, Oct. 3rd, 1842," and endorsed "Rec'd. 30 Mar. 1843." For the action of the mission see *Miss. Herald*, Sept. 1843, p. 356, also *Report* of the A.B.C.F.M., 1843, p. 169.

The statement in Mr. Walker's diary, under date of September 28, is : "At breakfast the Dr. let out what was his plan in view of the state of things. We persuaded them to get together and talk matters over. I think they felt some better afterwards. Then the question was submitted to us of the Dr.'s going home which we felt that it was one of too much importance to be decided in a moment, but finally came to the conclusion if he could put things at that station in such a state we could consent to his going and with that left them and made a start for home." From the MS. in the possession of the Oregon State Historical Society.

² The word is "committee" in my transcript, but it may be an error in copying.

no doubt if his plan succeeds it will be of great good to the mission and the country."¹

This letter was endorsed by Cushing Eells: "I am happy to say that the subjects of this letter have been frequently discussed of late by Mr. Walker and myself. I do not now recollect that there has been any important difference in the conclusions arrived at." Mr. Spalding wrote from Clearwater, October 15, a letter of twenty quarto pages in answer to the letter of the Board of February 26, 1842.² It is a reply to the charges preferred against him and contains not a word about Whitman's journey. Mr. W. H. Gray wrote from Waiilatpu, October 3, 1842, to the Board to announce his appointment as "Secular Agent and General Superintendent of the Oregon Institute" and his release by the mission. He adds: "Dr. Whitman will be able to give you the particulars respecting the affairs of the mission and the results of the last meeting," etc., etc.³

Mrs. Whitman wrote to her absent husband from Waskopum, March 4, 1843: "I have never felt to regret in the least that you have gone—for I fully believe the hand of the Lord was in it—and that he has yet blessings in store for Oregon. Yes, for these poor degraded Indians." Again, from Waiilatpu, May 18, 1843, "wishing you my dear husband . . . as speedy a return to the bosom of your family as the business of the Lord upon which you have gone will admit of."⁴

In none of these letters nor in any received from the members of the Oregon mission is there even a hint that Dr. Whitman had another purpose in going East than to save and reinforce the mission. Nor do these contemporary letters support in the slightest degree the picturesque narrative of the scene at the dinner at Walla Walla, with the rejoicing over the emigrants from the Red River, for the very good reason that this Hudson's Bay Company emigration arrived the year before!⁵ All this part of the Whitman story is ab-

¹ Letter-book as before. Cf. the "Remarks" in the *Miss. Herald*, Sept. 1843, p. 356.

² Letter-book, "Oregon Indians."

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Letter-book, "Oregon Indians."

⁵ Sir George Simpson, *An Overland Journey Round the World*, Philadelphia, 1847, I. 62 and 94. There were twenty-three families in the party. "Chaque année il vient du Canada un certain nombre de familles qui ne sont point engagées. À la fin de 1841, il en est arrivé trente de la colonie de la Rivière Rouge; près de la moitié s'est établi au Ouallamet." Du Flot de Mofras, *Explorations du Territoire de l'Oregon*, etc., pendant les Années 1840, 1841 et 1842, Paris, 1844, II. 209. Cf. Bancroft's *Oregon*, I. 252; also Myron Eells, *History of Indian Missions on the Pacific Coast*, Philadelphia, 1882, p. 166.

The mistake of dating this Red River emigration in 1842 apparently originated with Gustavus Hines in his *Oregon: Its History, Condition and Prospects*, etc., Buffalo, 1851, p. 387. This book was written while Hines was in the East (cf. Bancroft, *Oregon*, I. 225, note) and the mistake was a not unnatural slip of the memory. It had a curious result, however, of supplying the mythical occasion of Whitman's journey.

solutely destitute of contemporary evidence, is irreconcilable with established facts, and is, in fact, purely fictitious.

As most of the rest of it is equally imaginary it may be well at this point to examine into its origin and the trustworthiness of its author before pursuing the detailed criticism of the narrative.

The fictitious account of Whitman's journey, its causes, purpose and achievements, originated with his colleague in the Oregon mission, the Rev. H. H. Spalding.¹ It subsequently received apparent confirmation by the testimony of others connected with the mission, as W. H. Gray, Cushing Eells, and Dr. Whitman's nephew, Perrin B. Whitman. All this testimony is later than Spalding's original statement and gives the clearest internal evidence of having been either derived from him or colored by his narrative. At the time of the Whitman massacre Spalding underwent a terrible nervous and physical strain and apparently never recovered from his sufferings.² He believed the massacre had been instigated by the Catholic missionaries and this belief made him almost if not quite a monomaniac

¹ "Mr. Spalding, his first and most zealous associate, attempted to bring these facts before the world, but the caution of those who would whitewash his (Dr. Whitman's) sepulchre induced Mr. Spalding to give up in despair." Gray's *Oregon*, 482. The reader will find reason to question the truthfulness of the concluding words. "Rev. H. H. Spalding was about the first person to make known the fact of Dr. Whitman's going East on a political errand. Dr. G. H. Atkinson learned of it, and believed that this work ought to be set to the credit of missions. He said so publicly. In his journey East in 1865 he told the secretaries of the American Board that while they had been accustomed to look upon their Oregon mission as a failure it was a grand success. They were very skeptical and thought that many extravagant assertions had been made about Whitman's achievement. Dr. Atkinson replied: 'Write to Dr. Eells, as you know him to be careful in his statements and are accustomed to rely on what he says.'" Myron Eells, *Father Eells, or the Results of Fifty-five Years of Missionary Labors in Washington and Oregon; A Biography of Cushing Eells, D.D.*, Boston, 1894, p. 106. Secretary Treat wrote to Dr. Eells and from Dr. Eells's reply which was published in the *Missionary Herald*, Dec., 1866, pp. 370-72, and from the statements Dr. Atkinson had made he prepared an address on "Early Indian Missions," which he delivered at the meeting of the American Board in Pittsfield, Sept. 27, 1866. The report of this address in the *Congregationalist*, Oct. 5, 1866, is the earliest printed version of the Whitman story that I have found. It does not contain the Fort Walla Walla incident. As Mr. Treat was the Secretary of the Board in 1843, and at all times had access to the records I have quoted, one must regret that his desire to believe the Spalding story and to have it believed deterred him from making any serious attempt to verify it. That he was conscious of the inconsistency with the records is evident in his comment on Dr. Eells's letter, *Miss. Herald*, 1866, p. 374.

² "A poor broken-down wreck, caused by the frightful ending of his fellow associates, and of his own missionary labors." Gray's *Oregon*, p. 482. "His nervous system remained a wreck ever afterward." Mrs. F. F. Victor, *River of the West*, Hartford, 1870, p. 409. "There can be no doubt that Spalding's mind was injured by this shock. All his subsequent writings show a want of balance, which inclines me to regard with lenity certain erroneous statements in his publications. I find in the *Oregon Statesman* of August 11, 1855, this line: 'H. H. Spalding, a lunatic upon the subject of Catholicism and not over and above sane upon any subject.'" H. H. Bancroft, *Oregon*, I., 665, note.

on the subject of Catholicism. His repeated charges brought forth an answer from Brouillet the Vicar-General of Walla Walla,¹ and nine years later Brouillet's pamphlet was included by J. Ross Browne in an official report which he made on the causes of the Indian War in Oregon and Washington.²

Brouillet's reply is temperate in tone but makes assertions about the attitude of the Indians toward the Protestant missionaries and the causes of it, which the missionaries regarded as slanders. But to have this Catholic pamphlet distributed as a public document by the government incensed Spalding beyond endurance and roused him to ceaseless efforts to overwhelm the Catholics with obloquy.³ By lecturing on the Protestant missions, the work of Whitman and the massacre, and by getting various religious bodies and groups of prominent men to pass resolutions drafted by himself he accumulated a mass of material which he got published under the title : *Early Labors of the Missionaries of the American Board, etc., in Oregon, etc.*, as Executive Document 37 (Senate), 41st Congress, 3rd session. It was as an element in this extraordinary campaign of vindication that the legendary story of Whitman was developed.⁴ Nothing could more effectively catch the public ear and prepare the public mind for resentment against the Catholics than to show that Whitman saved Oregon to the United States and then lost his life a sacrifice to the malignant disappointment of the "Jesuits" and the Hudson's Bay Company. This conjecture is very strongly supported by Spalding's allegation in his memorial "American Congress vs. Protestantism in Oregon." "That there is abundant proof to show that the said Whitman massacre and the long and expensive wars that followed were commenced by the above said British

¹ *Protestantism in Oregon : Account of the Murder of Dr. Whitman and the Ungrateful Calumnies of H. H. Spalding, Protestant Missionary*, by the Rev. J. B. A. Brouillet, N. Y., 1853. Brouillet had saved Spalding's life.

² *Executive Docs. (House of Rep.)*, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., No. 38. Spalding's charges are quoted on pages 49-51.

³ Spalding did not become aware of the republication of Brouillet's pamphlet for some years (*Senate Ex. Doc. 37*, 41st Cong., 3rd Sess., p. 5).

⁴ The date cannot be fixed with precision. Dr. Atkinson brought the story to Boston in 1865. Secretary Treat wrote Dr. Eells in consequence, Feb. 22, 1866. Bancroft says, I. 657, note : "In 1866-67 Spalding revived the memories of twenty years before, and delivered a course of lectures on the subject of the Waiilatpu mission which were published in the *Albany (Or.) States Rights Democrat* extending over a period from November 1866 to February 1867." But the lectures apparently began at least one year earlier, for in one of them printed in the *Early Labors* he says it is eighteen years since the massacre, which occurred in November, 1847. *Exec. Doc. 37*, p. 26.

Extracts from Spalding's lecture and from his memorial entitled "American Congress vs. Protestantism in Oregon" are given in the appendix to this article as "The Primary Source of the Whitman Legend." The date of the publication of *Doc. 37* was 1871.

monopoly for the purpose of breaking up the American settlements and of regaining the territory, and that they were especially chagrined against the said Whitman as being the principal agent in disappointing this scheme."¹

The constant reiteration of the Whitman story in Spalding's collection of materials in *Doc.* 37 still further illustrates the reliance that was placed upon it.²

Having shown the circumstances under which the Whitman story was first brought to light it is now time for us to examine into Spalding's veracity or trustworthiness as a source. The earliest testimony we have on this point is Gray's letter to the American Board from Waiilatpu, October 14, 1840. "*Duplicity* is a trait in his character that never in all probability will change."³ The most conclusive proof of Spalding's untrustworthiness if not dishonesty in matters relating to this missionary history can be given. While Dr. Whitman was absent from his mission on his journey east in 1842-1843 his mill was burned by the Indians. Elijah White, the United States sub-Indian-agent, made a special investigation of the circumstances and reported in his letter of April 1, 1843, to Commissioner Crawford at Washington that the chief Feathercat "acknowledged his opinion that the mill was burnt purposely by some disaffected persons towards Dr. Whitman." Extracts from this letter were quoted by Spalding in his *Early Labors*, but following the word "Whitman" he inserted this additional sentence: "The mill, lumber and a great quantity of grain was burned by Catholic Indians, instigated by Romanists, to break up the Protestant mission, and prevent supplies to the on-coming emigration by Dr. Whitman."⁴

This interpolation was made deliberately in an official document for the purpose of manufacturing evidence of previous Catholic malignity which would render plausible Spalding's accusation in regard to the massacre. Again, where Dr. White quotes an old chief as saying in regard to the conference he was holding: "Clark pointed to this day, to you, and this occasion; we have long waited

¹ *Exec. Doc.* 37, p. 42. In the report of Dr. G. H. Atkinson's address before the American Board at Norwich in 1868 it is said: "He told most effectively the story of the manner in which the heroic missionary Dr. Whitman, who was subsequently murdered for the deed, made the journey from Oregon to Washington in 1842," etc. The *Congregationalist*, Oct. 15, 1868. Presumably this address is the same one that Dr. Atkinson later made before the New York Chamber of Commerce, Dec. 3, 1868 (N. Y., John W. Amerman), which contained the legendary interviews with Webster and Tyler, etc.

² Cf. for example, pp. 20-23, 25, 42, 75-76, and 78; cf. *Exec. Doc.* 37. 41st Cong., 3rd Sess.

³ Letter-book, "Oregon Indians."

⁴ Cf. the text of White's letter in *Ten Years in Oregon: Travels and Adventures of Doctor E. White and Lady*, etc., Ithaca, N. Y., 1850, and in Gray's *Oregon*, p. 229, with *Exec. Doc.* 37, p. 13.

in expectation; sent three of our sons to Red River School to prepare for it," Spalding changed the last clause to "sent three of our sons to the rising sun to obtain the book from Heaven," thus manufacturing first-hand confirmation of the somewhat doubtful story of the Indians who came to St. Louis for the Bible.¹

Inasmuch as Gray is commonly considered an independent contemporary witness for the Whitman story it is necessary to examine his trustworthiness.² Gray was at Waiilatpu when the missionaries discussed the recall of Spalding and the discontinuance of the Southern mission. Yet in letters in the *Daily* and *Weekly Astorian*, reprinted in circular No. 8³ of the Pioneer and Historical Society of Oregon, he said: "The order to abandon the mission I confess is new to me;" and in reply to Mrs. F. F. Victor's assertion that Dr. Whitman went East to secure a reversal of the order he denied that a meeting of the mission was held in September 1842⁴ which authorized Whitman's journey. He thus deliberately denies something that he must have known perfectly well if he remembered anything at all about the transaction, and professes ignorance of another fact of which he could not have been ignorant. Gray shared Spalding's intense prejudices and vindictiveness toward the Hudson's Bay Company and the Catholic missionaries. His *History of Oregon* is utterly untrustworthy as a source of Oregon history.⁵

Although many others have testified in recent years to the truth of the Spalding narrative, not a particle of contemporary evidence has ever been advanced in its support; later testimony has all been colored by the public discussions and men have remembered what Spalding said, not what happened. A convincing example of this fact is furnished by the letter of Cushing Eells of May 28, 1866. He was present at Waiilatpu and was the secretary of the mission meeting, yet he writes in reply to an inquiry

¹ Cf. *Ten Years in Oregon*, p. 185, and Gray's *Oregon*, p. 225, with *Exec. Doc.* 37, p. 13.

² He affirms that his account of the Fort Walla Walla incident is based on "his own knowledge!" *Hist. of Oregon*, p. 289.

³ *Circular* 8, pp. 5-6.

⁴ He wrote the Board from Waiilatpu Oct. 3, 1842. "Dr. Whitman will be able to give you all the particulars respecting the affairs of the mission and the results of the last meeting." Letter-book, "Oregon Indians."

⁵ "It would require a book as large as Gray's to correct Gray's mistakes." Bancroft's *History of the Northwest Coast*, II. 536. "It has, however, three faults—lack of arrangement, acrimonious partisanship, and disregard for truth." Bancroft, *History of Oregon*, I. 302. "His book, in my best judgment, is a bitter, prejudiced, sectarian, controversial work in the form of a history." Peter H. Burnett, *Recollections and Opinions of an Old Pioneer*, N. Y., 1880, p. 222. These last two judgments I regard as absolutely just.

It will not escape notice that both Spalding and Gray suppress all reference to the missionary troubles in 1842 and to the action of the Board.

that "the single object of Dr. Whitman, . . . was to make a desperate effort to save the country to the United States."¹ Then follows a paragraph on Whitman's experience in Washington and the Oregon situation, which was derived from Spalding and can not have been Dr. Eells's recollection of Whitman's report, because, as will be shown presently, it cannot have been true. If in Dr. Eells's mind Spalding's inventions had displaced his own recollections, how much weight is to be attached to the testimony of Perrin B. Whitman, Dr. Whitman's nephew, who was only thirteen years of age in 1843?²

The foregoing discussion of the account given by Spalding and Gray of the occasion of Whitman's journey East³ does not aim to disprove that he intended to go to Washington, and to do what he could for the advantage of Oregon. Owing to the infrequency of communication with people from the Pacific coast and the wide public interest in the Oregon territory he could feel assured, of being welcomed and of conveying useful information. The only evidences of such intentions that I have found, that are uncontaminated by Spalding's fictions, are a reference in Dr. White's letter of April 1, 1843,⁴ to the Indian Commissioner at Washington, and A. L. Lovejoy's recollections as given in his letter to Dr. Atkinson in 1876. Lovejoy came to Oregon in the emigration of 1842 and was induced to return with Whitman. He writes :

"The day after our arrival Dr. Whitman called at our camp and asked me to accompany him to his house, as he wished me to draw up a memorial to Congress to prohibit the sale of ardent spirits in this country. The Doctor was alive to the interests of this coast, and manifested a very

¹ *Missionary Herald*, 1866, top p. 371.

² P. B. Whitman in a letter "To the Public," Oct. 11, 1880, said that Whitman's journey was for the double purpose of bringing out an immigration and to prevent the trading off of the Northwest coast. *Circular* 8 of the Oregon Pioneer and Historical Society, p. 12. His age is derived from Dr. Whitman's letter to the Board, May 30, 1843. Letter-book, "Oregon Indians."

³ That he went East on the business of the mission was a matter of common knowledge at the time. "In 1842 Dr. Whitman visited the United States to obtain further assistance, in order to strengthen the efforts that had already been made. . . . In 1843 Dr. Whitman returned again to Oregon and resumed his labors." *Ten Years in Oregon*, by D. Lee and J. H. Frost, N. Y., 1844. According to Nixon, Mrs. Whitman's diary reveals nothing as to a political object. He explains this silence on the ground that absolute secrecy was necessary. *How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon*, Chicago, 1895, p. 107. Yet according to Gray, Whitman defiantly announced his purpose at the Fort Walla Walla dinner. Gray's *Oregon*, p. 288. Spalding in his contemporary letter to Dr. White the sub-Indian-agent mentions Whitman's visit to the States but gives no reason. White's *Ten Years in Oregon*, 202. Gray's *Oregon*, p. 235.

⁴ He writes that the country of the Cayuse Indians "is well-watered, gently undulating, extremely healthy, and admirably adapted to grazing, as Dr. Whitman may have informed you, who resides in their midst." White's *Ten Years in Oregon*, p. 174; also in Gray, p. 219.

warm desire to have it properly represented at Washington ; and after numerous conversations with the Doctor touching the future prosperity of Oregon, he asked me one day in a very anxious manner, if I thought it would be possible for him to cross the mountains at that time of the year. I told him I thought he could. He next asked : ' Will you accompany me ? ' After a little reflexion, I told him I would."¹

Of Whitman's presence in Washington I have been able so far to find not a trace of local contemporary evidence. There is nothing in the *Globe* or the *National Intelligencer* among Washington papers, or in *Niles's Register*, although its pages for 1843 contain many insignificant items of Oregon news, or in the Washington correspondence of the *Tribune* or the *Journal of Commerce*. Curtis's *Webster* and Webster's *Private Correspondence* are alike silent. Interested as John Quincy Adams was in all diplomatic matters, Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Relations, watchful and suspicious of the administration, his voluminous *Diary* knows nothing of Marcus Whitman. Equally devoid of light are Benton's *Thirty Years' View*, although Benton was a champion of Oregon, and Greenhow's *History of Oregon*, although Greenhow was a translator in the State Department and an indefatigable collector of information about Oregon.² The *Life and Speeches* of Senator Linn, of Missouri, who was the most advanced leader of the Oregon party, make no reference to Whitman. Tyler's *Tyler* lacks any contemporary reference to Whitman's presence in Washington, and if the author had found any he would have given it because he makes some conjectures as to the origin of the notion that Whitman exerted any influence on the diplomacy of that year.³

The only contemporary evidence of Whitman's activity in Washington which has ever been advanced is in a letter which he wrote to the Secretary of War after his return to Oregon. The letter ac-

¹ Nixon, *How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon*, p. 306. Lovejoy's letter occupies pp. 305-312. Lovejoy's letter to Gray of Nov. 6, 1869, is similar in tenor as a whole but does not mention all the facts quoted above. Gray, pp. 324-327.

² Greenhow's preface is dated February 1844. He devotes twenty-five pages to the Oregon Question in 1843 and half a page to the Emigration of that year, p. 391.

³ Tyler's *Letters and Times of the Tylers*, II. 439. In the appendix is a letter from Dr. Silas Reed under date of April 8, 1885, which twice makes mention of Whitman's visit to Washington but says nothing further than that he "furnished valuable data about Oregon and the practicability of a wagon route thereto across the mountains," p. 697. Too much stress cannot be laid on this, as Dr. Reed was an old man and his memory might easily have been colored by Barrows's *Oregon* then recently published. In at least one very important point in this letter he seems to have remembered more than occurred. See p. 699. In the *Atlantic Monthly* for Oct., 1880, in an art. entitled "Reminiscences of Washington" there is what appears to be an independent recollection of Whitman's visit to Washington, but it bears the familiar marks of Spalding's invention. It was written by Ben. Perley Poore. All that needs to be said is that Poore spent the years 1841-1848 in Europe and the East !

companies the draft of a bill to promote safe intercourse with Oregon and begins: "In compliance with the request you did me the honor to make last winter while in Washington I herewith transmit," etc.¹ In addition to this there is Lovejoy's recollection of what Whitman told him during their return. Lovejoy writes:

"The Doctor often expressed himself to me about the remainder of his journey, and the manner in which he was received at Washington and by the Board of Missions at Boston. The Doctor had several interviews with President Tyler, Secretary Webster and many members of Congress, touching the interests of Oregon. He urged the immediate termination of the treaty with Great Britain relative to this country, and the extension of the laws of the United States, and to provide liberal inducements to emigrants to come to this coast."²

All this is probable, but there was nothing novel in it, because the Linn Bill which had passed the Senate the month before had all these objects in view. Lovejoy's recollection shows not a trace of the Spalding legend of Whitman's having arrived in the nick of time to save Oregon from being "traded off for a cod fishery." Every account that has been published of Whitman's interviews with Tyler and Webster except this of Lovejoy is entirely fictitious, and not only fictitious but impossible, and could have originated only with a man ignorant of diplomacy in general and of the Oregon diplomacy in particular.

In the first place, Oregon was in no danger of being lost to the United States. The real danger was that the government would be pushed by the Oregon advocates in the West into an aggressive policy which might result in war with England.³ When the Linn Bill passed the Senate February 3, by a vote of 24 to 22, providing for the extension of the laws of the United States over the whole of the Oregon territory, the erection of courts and the granting of lands to settlers,⁴ there was not the slightest danger of the Senate ratifying a treaty to alienate the territory. The appearance of a solitary missionary in Washington advocating what a majority of the Senate had already voted, and what state legislatures were demanding in resolutions⁵ was veritably a drop in

¹ See Nixon, p. 315.

² Gray's *Oregon*, p. 326. I use the earlier letter this time, the only essential difference between the two being a parenthetical statement that Congress was in session when Whitman arrived, which is a mistake and may be an explanatory afterthought of Lovejoy's.

³ Lord Palmerston said in the House of Commons, March 21, "if that bill passed into a law, an event which he conceived to be impossible, it would amount to a declaration of war." *London Times*, March 22, 1843, p. 3, col. 4.

⁴ The bill and the debates are conveniently summarized by Greenhow, pp. 377-388.

⁵ "There were militant resolutions of the Legislatures of Illinois and of Missouri, relating to the Territory of Oregon." J. Q. Adams's memorandum of a meeting of the

the bucket, and of equal significance. That Whitman influenced American diplomacy in any way at Washington is not only destitute of all evidence but is intrinsically improbable. The belief that he did so originated with Spalding, and the ever-present stamp of his invention in all the varying narratives is the reference to "trading off Oregon for a cod-fishery."¹

The fisheries were not a subject of negotiation in 1842, nor were they proposed for the expected negotiation of 1843.² Consequently

Committee of Foreign Affairs, Feb. 25, 1843. *Diary*, XI. 327. Feb. 9, Representative Reynolds, chairman of a select committee on Oregon, reported a bill for the immediate occupation of the territory. *Niles's Register*, XLIII. 397; Adams's *Diary*, XI. 314.

¹For the recurrence of this note, see Spalding, *Exec. Doc.* 37, pp. 22, 75; Eells in *Miss. Herald*, 1866, p. 371; Atkinson, *ibid.*, 1869, p. 79; Gray, *Oregon*, p. 316; Victor, *Overland Monthly*, Aug. 1869, p. 155; Poore in *Atlantic Monthly*, Oct. 1880, p. 534; Eells, *History of Indian Missions*, p. 174; Nixon, *How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon*, p. 128-9. Barrows in his *Oregon*, pp. 224-238, shows that the interviews are unhistorical by a process which completely undermines the rest of his narrative. Leaving the question of candor or honesty aside, what can be said of the truthworthiness of a writer who says, p. 233, that there is no evidence that Sir George Simpson was in Washington in 1842-1843 and yet incorporates the myth in his narrative on pp. 153, 158, 202, 203, 204, going so far on p. 203 as to reconstruct a conversation with Webster out of Sir George's *Overland Journey Round the World*? Barrows puts into Webster's mouth a remark about Whitman which was made by an anonymous friend of Webster's to an anonymous writer! Cf. Barrows, p. 225, with *Exec. Doc.* 37, p. 24, or Nixon, p. 133. Spalding does the same thing in his headline. The article is cited by Spalding from the *Independent*, Jan., 1870, but it is not there and has not been found, although a careful search has been made for it. Again, although Barrows lived near Boston, there is no evidence that he ever looked at the *Missionary Herald* for 1842-1843 or the *Reports of the Board* for those years. Barrows's method is unscientific and bewildering to the last degree. He goes over the same ground repeatedly and presents different and inconsistent accounts of the same transactions.

It is but justice to say that Mrs. Victor enjoys the lonely distinction of being the only writer, so far as I know, who, having once published the legend, upon a more careful study of the evidence has had the open-mindedness to see and declare its legendary character. As the avowed author of Bancroft's *Oregon*, working under his editorial supervision, every student of Oregon history is under obligations to her for her scholarly and honest presentation of the facts derived from the unparalleled collection of materials gathered by Mr. Bancroft. While I have been greatly assisted in this study by the bibliographical notes and in a less degree by the text in the Bancroft *History*, every important assertion in this article is my own matured conviction. It is a rare experience in a critical examination of sources to find in any general history so faithful and trustworthy a presentation of the contents of those sources as in the parts of the first volume of Bancroft's *Oregon* that I have subjected to this test. The aspersions cast upon Mrs. Victor and the Bancroft *History* by writers too lazy to find out the facts or too blinded by prejudice to see them or too dishonest to report them may have goaded her into counter-assertions and judgments not so carefully weighed as the text of the *History*, but such criticisms and charges as Nixon brought against the *History* and her work entitle him to rank with Gray in candor and trustworthiness, than which no more can be said. Cf. the *San Francisco Call*, Sept. 1, 1895, and *How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon*, pp. 205-216.

²"The only question of magnitude about which I did not negotiate with Lord Ashburton is the question respecting the fisheries." Webster to Mrs. Paige, Aug. 23, 1842, *Private Correspondence*, II. 146. That the fisheries were not to be considered in 1843 is shown by Webster's letter to Minister Everett, Nov. 28, 1842, *ibid.*, 153-4.

Webster could not have told Whitman what Spalding attributes to him. It is in the highest degree improbable that either Tyler or Webster told Whitman anything about their plans, for the President refused to give the Senate that information in December 1842,¹ and it was only with the greatest difficulty that John Quincy Adams wormed it out of Webster on March 25, in the course of a three-hour interview.² Equally fictitious is the story of Sir George Simpson's presence in Washington to negotiate or to influence negotiations in regard to Oregon and the fisheries.³

That Whitman's visit East dispelled ignorance about Oregon or inspired enthusiasm are equally without foundation. No doubt he could contribute some facts of interest, but the widely circulated *Travels* of Farnham were in the field;⁴ Greenhow's exhaustive history was being distributed as a public document; Fremont was under commission to explore the Rockies; the Wilkes Exploring Expedition had explored the Columbia River and Puget Sound Regions two years earlier, and Sub-Indian-Agent White was writing frequent reports to his superiors at Washington. The ignorance and indifference of the government and the public are fictions of a later day.

In such investigation of the newspapers as I have been able to make I have found just one news item about Whitman's journey East, outside of the missionary intelligence of two or three religious papers which refer to his visit to Boston. Whitman called on Horace Greeley in the last part of March and gave him some account of the conditions in Oregon and of his journey. There is not a word in the interview that indicates that he had a political errand

¹ See Pres. Tyler's special message Dec. 23, in reply to the Senate Resolution of Dec. 22, 1842. *Statesman's Year Book*, II. 1315, or *Niles's Register*, LXIII. 286.

² Adams's *Diary*, XI. 344-347. The real Oregon policy of the administration was something very different from Spalding's invention. It was to yield to England the territory north of the Columbia if England would acquiesce in or promote our acquisition of California from San Francisco harbor northward and the annexation of Texas to the United States. English influence was strong in Mexico and it was believed that if England urged these concessions on Mexico she would grant them for a reasonable consideration. See Adams's *Diary*, XI. 340, 347, 351, and 355; Tyler's *Tyler*, II. 692 and 698. That Webster revealed this project to Adams March 25 and about the same time or even later approached General Almonte the Mexican minister on the subject shows that Whitman's interviews, if he had them, had not had the slightest effect. See Adams's *Diary*, XI. 347 and 355, entries of Mar. 25 and April 7. The legendary date of Whitman's arrival in Washington was March 2 or 3. He arrived later than that, but probably not so late as the 25th.

³ I have nowhere found a reference to his presence in Washington outside of the Spalding narrative and its derivatives, nor is there any evidence that he ever had any communications with the Washington authorities on the Oregon question.

⁴ *Travels in the Great Western Prairies, the Anahuac and Rocky Mountains and in the Oregon Territory*, by T. J. Farnham, New York, 1843.

or wished to stir up public sentiment on Oregon.¹ Here was a unique opportunity to reach the public, for Greeley was much interested in Oregon and printed all the news relative to it that he could gather, and had published a cheap edition of Farnham's *Travels* which had an immense sale.²

Turning now to Boston we find in the records of his conferences with the Board the real history of his journey and its purpose. His own statement is summarized in the record as follows :

"Left the Oregon country 3rd. October, 1842, and arrived at Westport, Mo., 15 February³ and in Boston 30 March 1843. Left unexpectedly and brought few letters. Letters of March 1842 had been received and acted on. The difficulties between Mr. Spalding and others were apparently healed, and Mr. S. promises to pursue a different course. The mission wish to make another trial with Mr. Smith and Mr. Gray out of the mission. Mr. Gray requests a dismissal and has left the mission and gone to the Methodist settlement. Mr. Rogers also.⁴ . . . There is, however, an influx of Papists and many emigrants from the U. S. are expected. The religious influence needs to be strengthened. The mission therefore propose and request that :

1. One preacher be sent to join them to labor at Waiilatpu—and that
2. A company of some five or ten men may be found [formed?] of piety and intelligence, not to be appointed by the Board or to be immediately connected with it, who will go to the Oregon country as Christian men, and who, on some terms to be agreed upon, shall take most of the land which the mission have under cultivation with the mills and shops at the several stations, with the most of the stock and utensils, paying the mission in produce from year to year, in seed to the Indians, and assistance rendered to them—or in some similar manner, the particulars to be decided upon in consultation with the men. The result of this would be :

1. Introducing a band of religious men into the country to exert a good religious influence on the Indians and the White population which may come in especially near the mission stations.

2. Counteracting papal efforts and influences.

3. Releasing the missionaries from the great amount of manual labor, which is now necessary for them for their subsistence, and permitting

¹This interesting description of Whitman's appearance and travels is too long to quote in full. He impressed Greeley as a "noble pioneer, . . . a man fitted to be a chief in rearing a moral Empire among the wild men of the wilderness. . . . He brings information that the settlers in the Willamette are doing well, that the Americans are building a town at the falls of the Willamette." Then follows an item in regard to members of Farnham's party and Whitman's itinerary. "We give the hardy and self-denying pioneer a hearty welcome to his native land." *N. Y. Weekly Tribune*, Mar. 30, 1843. This item was copied into the *Cleveland Herald* of April 6. In the same issue appeared three columns of extracts from the *N. Y. Tribune's* cheap edition of Farnham's *Travels*. Any one can draw correct conclusions as to the relative strength of these two influences.

² *Weekly Tribune*, May 25.

³If Whitman did not arrive at Westport till Feb. 15, it is clear that he could not have reached Washington Mar. 2 or 3, as is alleged in the legendary account. It was a physical impossibility in 1843. Westport is about 323 miles from St. Louis.

⁴The omitted passage reports the condition of the Indians and the friendliness of the traders at Fort Walla Walla.

them to devote themselves to appropriate missionary work among the Indians, whose language they now speak.

4. Doing more for the civilisation and social improvement of the Indians than the mission can do unaided.

5. It would afford facilities for religious families to go into the country and make immediately a comfortable settlement, with the enjoyment of Christian privileges,—both those who might be introduced upon the lands now occupied by the mission and others who might be induced to go, and settle in the vicinity of the stations.

6. It would save the mission from the necessity of trading with immigrants. Those now enter the country (*sic*) expect to purchase or beg their supplies from the mission for a year or two, and it would be thought cruel to refuse provide (*sic*) such supplies.¹

Then follow a few facts about Oregon but not a word on the political question or Whitman's trip to Washington. According to Lovejoy's recollection² Whitman felt that the Board disapproved of his action in coming East. Of this there is no record. Yet the self-defensive tone of his later letters reflects the same impression. In such a conjuncture what more effective defense could he have made than to show the urgency of the political crisis in Oregon and in Washington?

Whitman's journey in fact was measurably successful, and the requests of the mission were granted. The minute in regard to his project for an emigration was: "A plan which he proposed for taking with him, on his return to the mission, a small company of intelligent and pious laymen, to settle at or near the mission station, but without expense to the Board or any connection with it, was so far approved that he was authorized to take such men, if those of a suitable character and with whom satisfactory arrangements could be made, can be found."³

Such was Whitman's plan of emigration,⁴ and how different from the legendary proposal to Tyler and Webster to take out a thousand emigrants! The fact that Whitman returned in company with the emigration of 1843 has been transformed by legend into the accomplishment of a previously announced purpose to organize and conduct such a body of emigrants. Whitman, however, did not organ-

¹ Submitted to the Prudential Committee April 4, 1843, Doct. Marcus Whitman. Abenakis and Oregon Indians, Letter-book, 248.

² Gray's *Oregon*, p. 326; Nixon, p. 311.

³ Records of the Prudential Committee. Cf. *Report of the A. B. C. F. M.*, for 1843, pp. 169-173; *Missionary Herald*, Sept., 1843, p. 356.

⁴ He seems to have made it public in a measure before leaving Oregon. At any rate Hines refers to "the departure of Dr. Whitman to the United States with the avowed intention of bringing back with him as many as he could enlist for Oregon" as having alarmed the Indians. It was also rumored that the Nez Percés had dispatched one of their chiefs to incite the Indians of the buffalo country to cut off Whitman's party on his return. Hines's *Oregon*, Auburn and Buffalo, 1851, p. 143. Hines's narrative is based on his diary at the time.

ize the emigration of 1843, but joined it and rendered valuable services *en route*. As the facts about the emigration of 1843 are perfectly accessible in Bancroft,¹ I shall merely quote from Whitman's letters such extracts as will illustrate his purposes and his own view of what he had accomplished by coming East.

On May 12, 1843, Whitman writes from St. Louis, "I have made up my mind that it would not be expedient to try and take any families across this year except such as can go at this time. For that reason I have found it my duty to go on with the party myself." Calling attention to the Catholic missionary efforts, for which he refers the committee to De Smedt's *Indian Sketches*, he continues, "I think by a careful consideration of this together with these facts and movements you will realize our feelings that we must look with interest upon this the only spot on the Pacific Coast left where protestants have a present hope of a foothold. It is requisite that some good pious men and ministers go to Oregon without delay as citizens or our hope there is greatly clouded, if not destroyed."

On May 30, he writes again from Shawnee :

"I can not give you much of an account of the emigrants until we get on the road. It is said that there are over two hundred men besides women and children. They look like a fair representation of a country population. . . We do not ask you to become the patrons of emigration to Oregon, but we desire you to use your influence that in connexion with all the influx into this country there may be a good proportion of good men from our own denomination who shall avail themselves of the advantages of the country in common with others. . . . We cannot feel it at all just that we are doing nothing while worldly men and papists are doing so much. De Smedt's business in Europe can be seen, I think, at the top of the 23d page of his *Indian Sketches*, etc. You will see by his book I think that the papal effort is designed to convey over the country to the English. . . . I think our greatest hope for having Oregon at least part protestant now lies in encouraging a proper attention of good men to go there while the country is open. I want to call your attention to the operation of Farnham of Salem and the Bensons of N. York in Oregon. I am told credibly that secretly government aids them with the Secret service fund.² Capt. Howard of Maine, is also in expectation of being employed by government to take out emigrants should the Oregon bill pass."

¹ Cf. Bancroft, *Oregon*, I. 390 ff. It is perhaps unnecessary to say that Whitman never pretended that he organized the emigration. In his letter to the Secretary of War, received June 22, 1844, he wrote : "The Government will now doubtless for the first time be apprised through you, or by means of this communication, of the immense immigration of families to Oregon which has taken place this year. I have, since our interview, been instrumental in piloting . . . no less than three hundred families," etc. Nixon, p. 316. He would not have expressed himself in this way if his achievement had been the fulfillment of his pledge to Tyler to organize and conduct such a company.

² Cf. Parrish's statement in Bancroft, I. 177.

On November 1 he wrote from the Fort Walla Walla: "my journey across the mountains was very much prolonged by the necessity for me to pilot the emigrants. I tried to leave the party, at different points, and push forward alone, but I found that I could not do so without subjecting the emigrants to considerable risk." Then follows a plea for more help from the mission board:

"We very much need good men to locate themselves two, three or four in a place and secure a good influence for the Indians, and form a nucleus for religious institutions, and keep back Romanism. This country must be occupied by Americans or foreigners: if it is by the latter, they will be mostly papists. . . . I regret very much that I was obliged to return so soon to this country, but nothing was more evidently my duty. . . . Yet I do not regret having visited the States, for I feel that either this country must be American or else foreign and mostly papal. If I never do more than to have been one of the first to take white women across the mountains and prevent the disorder and inaction which would have occurred by the breaking up of the present emigration and establishing the first wagon road across to the border of the Columbia river, I am satisfied. I do not feel that we can look on and see foreign and papal influence making its greatest efforts and we hold ourselves as expatriated and neutral, I am determined to exert myself for my country and to procure such regulations and laws as will best secure both the Indians and white men in their transit and settlement intercourse."

In the following summer, on July 22, Whitman wrote in regard to the emigration of 1843, "The lateness of the spring prevented them from setting out so soon by a month as in ordinary seasons. No one but myself was present to give them the assurance of getting through,¹ which was necessary to keep up their spirits, and to counteract reports which were destined to meet and dishearten them at every stage of the journey."²

From these contemporary letters it is clear that Whitman made no claim to have organized the emigration of 1843 or to have rendered them services, beyond encouragement and advice and guidance. These services were amply recognized by the leaders of the emigration.

In Jesse Applegate's most interesting narrative, "A Day with the Cow Column," and in Peter H. Burnett's *Recollections* there are warm tributes to Whitman's disinterested and untiring efforts for the welfare of the emigration; but neither of these leaders of the movement intimates that the organization of the expedition was owing in any way to Whitman.³ In none of the strictly contemporary sources

¹ In Hastings's *Emigrant Guide to Oregon and California*, etc., Cincinnati, 1845, emigrants are cautioned not to leave Independence later than May 1. I. 147.

² All these letters are in the letter-book, "Oregon Indians." I may hereby express my appreciation of the courtesy with which the officials of the Board gave me access to their records.

³ Applegate's article was originally published in the *Overland Monthly*, Aug. 1868

is Whitman credited with having organized the emigration and in many of them he is not even mentioned.¹

The real force behind the emigration of 1843 was the provisions for granting lands to settlers in Linn's bill which it was expected would pass Congress in 1843.² That a large emigration was in preparation for 1843 Whitman knew in 1842, five months before he left Oregon. May 12, 1842, Gray wrote from Wailatpu: "There will probably be a large party of immigrants coming to this country in the spring of 1843. Some young men are now returning with the expectation of bringing out a party next Spring."³ That Whitman may have urged individuals to join the emigration is likely enough, and is affirmed by Lovejoy, but he had no time to do more, and they would not have had time to get ready unless they had begun before his arrival. The legendary account of Whitman's relation to the emigration of 1843 has been supported by a letter published by Spalding from John Zachrey, one of the emigrants of 1843, who wrote in 1868 that his father was influenced to go to Oregon by "a publication by Dr. Whitman, or from his representations."⁴ But no copy of this pamphlet has ever been found and it is difficult to find time for Whitman, who reached Westport I. 127-133. It is reprinted in Nixon's *How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon*, p. 146-163. Applegate says, "Whitman's great experience and indomitable energy were of priceless value to the emigrating column. . . . To no other individual are the emigrants of 1843 so much indebted for the successful conclusion of their journey as to Marcus Whitman," p. 131-132. Cf. Burnett's *Recollections and Opinions of an Old Pioneer*, N. Y., 1880, "Dr. Whitman, who had performed much hard labor for us and was deserving of our warmest gratitude," p. 126.

¹The emigration of 1843 attracted much attention in the newspapers, but Whitman's name is nowhere mentioned as a leader with those of the Applegates, Burnett and the others. See Burnett's *Recollections*, pp. 97-98. After Burnett decided to go, he "set to work to organize a wagon company. I visited the surrounding counties wherever I could find a sufficient audience and succeeded even beyond my own expectations." Cf. this extract from a letter from Iowa Territory dated Mar. 4, 1843. "Just now Oregon is the pioneer's land of promise. Hundreds are already prepared to start thither with the spring, while hundreds of others are anxiously awaiting the action of Congress in reference to that country, as the signal of their departure. Some have already been to view the country and have returned with a flattering tale of the inducements it holds out. They have painted it to their neighbors in the highest colors. These have told it to others. The Oregon fever has broken out and is now raging like any other contagion." *N. Y. Weekly Tribune*, April 1, 1843. As this letter is dated Mar. 4, and Whitman arrived at the present site of Kansas City, Feb. 15, and went straight to St. Louis, it is obvious he had no connection with this excitement. Several of the writers realizing this have attributed to Lovejoy the work of getting up the emigration; but he was at Bent's fort in Colorado while Whitman was in the East.

²The proofs of this are numerous. Dr. Whitman himself in a letter to the Secretary of War received June 24, 1844, says of the emigration: "The majority of them are farmers, lured by the prospect of bounty in lands, by the reported fertility of the soil," etc. Nixon, p. 316.

³Letter-book, "Oregon Indians."

⁴*Exec. Doc.* 37, p. 26.

February 15, and Boston March 30, and was back again in St. Louis May 12, to write a pamphlet which could be circulated in Texas, where Zachrey lived, early enough for his father to start from Independence, May 22, for Oregon.¹ We have seen how Spalding interpolated Dr. White's letter, and Zachrey's letter contains things that Whitman could not honestly have put in a pamphlet.²

As the years passed Dr. Whitman attached so much importance to his services to the emigration that he evidently came to regard such a service as the purpose of his journey to the East. If it had been among his purposes it was to such a degree incidental and minor that he apparently never mentioned it to the Committee of the American Board, nor did his fellow missionary, Mr. Walker, refer to it.

In 1847, in defending his return East in 1842, Whitman declared that the American interest in Oregon hinged on the success of the immigration of 1843. Had that been disastrous it may be easily seen what would have become of American interests. The disaster last year to those "who left the track I made for them in 1843 . . . demonstrates what I did in making my way to the States in the winter of 1842-3, after the third of October. It was to open a practical route and safe passage and secure a favorable report of the journey from emigrants, which in connection with other objects caused me to leave my family and brave the toils and dangers of the journey." He reiterates this same idea October 18.³

It may be questioned if the emigration of 1843 would have met with disaster if Whitman had not been with them, or, if it had,

¹ Burnett, *Recollections*, p. 99.

²For example "that he himself (that is Whitman) and mission party had taken their families, cattle and wagons through to the Columbia six years before." *Exec. Doc.* 37, p. 26. This was not true. Whitman changed his wagon into a two-wheeled cart at Fort Hall and left the two-wheeled cart at Fort Boisé. Bancroft, I. 133. Farnham saw it there in 1839. *Travels*, p. 77. In *Exec. Doc.* 37, pp. 74-78, is a series of resolutions adopted by the officials of a Baptist Church in Brownsville, Oregon, Oct. 22, 1869, which were evidently drafted by Spalding. In resolution 6, in a report of Whitman's interview with President Tyler, is this sentence: "By his personal representations to President Tyler of this country, of its vast importance, and his assurance of a wagon route, as he assured him we had taken cattle, a wagon, and his missionary families through six years before." Now the "we" may be an inadvertent survival of Spalding's language or a misprint for "he." The interesting thing is that the Zachrey letter supplies the materials for this report of Whitman's conversation with Tyler. As the statement was not true in either case, the most natural conclusion is that Spalding invented it and inserted it in the text of the Zachrey letter. The rest of the Zachrey letter probably represents the coalescence after twenty-three years in Zachrey's memory of what Whitman did on the way for the emigrants with the indistinct recollection of the inducements to start. It is probable that reports of some of Dr. White's speeches to promote emigration in 1842 (*cf.* White's *Ten Years in Ore. on*, pp. 142-143) reached the elder Zachrey, and the boy (he was seventeen years old) later attributed the efforts of White to Whitman.

³These letters were printed in the *Oregon Native Son*, Feb 1900, pp. 471-472.

whether that would have really made any difference in the history of the Oregon question. The sufferings of the emigration of 1846 did not prevent the southern road from being attempted again in 1847¹ and with success. The value of Whitman's services in 1843 was very great and need not be questioned. That they were indispensable is far from certain.

That the generally accepted story of Marcus Whitman is entirely unhistorical has been demonstrated. That this fictitious narrative should have been so widely diffused and accepted when the true story of Marcus Whitman was perfectly accessible in the Reports of the American Board and the volumes of the *Missionary Herald* is surprising. That this should have largely taken place since the publication of Bancroft's *History of Oregon* in 1885, which gives a clear and accurate account of what Whitman actually attempted and what he achieved, is almost incredible.

The results of this investigation will come to many as a shock. Extraordinary efforts have been made in good faith to disseminate the story of Marcus Whitman in order to raise money for a suitable memorial and especially for Whitman College, and to many interested in these enterprises this criticism of the Whitman legend will doubtless seem most unfortunate. Yet it is the true Marcus Whitman whom they wish to honor, the devoted and heroic missionary who braved every hardship and imperilled his life for the cause of Christian missions and Christian civilization in the far Northwest and finally died at his post, a sacrifice to the cause, and not a political *deus ex machina*, a figment of H. H. Spalding's invention. The sturdy manliness and Christian devotion of Marcus Whitman, the unceasing labors of his life and his death in the service of Christian missions in Oregon, fully deserve every honorable memorial. The perversion of history cannot honor such a man.

EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE.

APPENDIX

THE PRIMARY SOURCE OF THE WHITMAN LEGEND

I.

Extracts from the Lecture of H. H. Spalding, as given in Senate Exec. Doc. 37, 41st Congress, third session, pp. 18-22.

IN 1841 no missionaries crossed, but several emigrant families, bringing wagons, which, on reaching Fort Hall, suffered the same fate with those of 1840. In 1842 considerable emigration moved forward with ox teams and wagons, but on reaching Fort Hall the same story was told them,

¹ See Bancroft, I. 543-572.

and the teams were sacrificed, and the emigrant families reached Dr. Whitman's station late in the fall, in very destitute circumstances. About this time, as events proved, that shrewd English diplomatist, Governor Simpson, long a resident on the Northwest coast, reached Washington, [p. 19] after having arranged that an English colony of some 150 souls should leave the Selkirk Settlement on the Red River of the lakes in the Spring of 1842, and cross the Rocky Mountains by the Saskatchewan Pass.

DR. WHITMAN'S WINTER JOURNEY, 1843.

The peculiar event that aroused Dr. Whitman and sent him through the mountains of New Mexico, during that terrible winter of 1843, to Washington, just in time to save this now so valuable country from being traded off by Webster to the shrewd Englishman for a "cod fishery" down east, was as follows: In October of 1842 our mission was called together, on business, at Waiilatpu—Dr. Whitman's station—and while in session, Dr. W. was called to Fort Walla-Walla to visit a sick man. While there the "brigade" for New Caledonia, fifteen bateaux, arrived at that point on their way up the Columbia, with Indian goods for the New Caledonia or Frazer River country. They were accompanied by some twenty chief factors, traders, and clerks of the Hudson's Bay Company, and Bishop Demois, who had crossed the mountains from Canada, in 1839—the first Catholic priest on this coast; Bishop Blanchett came at the same time.

While this great company were at dinner, an express arrived from Fort Colville, announcing the (to them) glad news that the colony from Red River had passed the Rocky Mountains and were near Colville. An exclamation of joy burst from the whole table, at first unaccountable to Doctor Whitman, till a young priest, perhaps not so discreet as the older, and not thinking that there was an American at the table, sprang on his feet, and swinging his hand, exclaimed: "Hurrah for Columbia! (Oregon.) America is too late; we have got the country." In an instant, as by instinct, Dr. Whitman saw through the whole plan, clear to Washington, Fort Hall, and all. He immediately rose from the table and asked to be excused, sprang upon his horse, and in a very short time stood with his noble "Cayuse," white with foam, before his door; and without stopping to dismount, he replied to our anxious inquiries with great decision and earnestness: "I am going to cross the Rocky Mountains and reach Washington this Winter, God carrying me through, and bring out an emigration over the mountains next season, or this country is lost." The events soon developed that if that whole-souled American missionary was not the "son of a prophet," he guessed right when he said a "deep-laid scheme was about culminating which would deprive the United States of this Oregon, and it must be broken at once, or the country is lost." We united our remonstrances with those of sister Whitman, who was in deep agony at the idea of her husband perishing in the snows of the Rocky Mountains. We told him it would be a

miracle if he escaped death either from starving or freezing, or the savages, or the perishing of his horses, during the five months that would be required to make the only possible circuitous route, via Fort Hall, Taos, Santa Fé, and Bent Fort. His reply was that of my angel wife six years before: "I am ready, not to be bound only, but to die at Jerusalem or in the snows of the Rocky Mountains for the [p. 20] name of the Lord Jesus or my country. I am a missionary, it is true, but my country needs me now." And taking leave of his missionary associates, his comfortable home, and his weeping companion, with little hope of seeing them again in this world, he entered upon his fearful journey the 2d of October 1842, and reached the City of Washington the 2d of March 1843, with his face, nose, ears, hands, feet, and legs badly frozen. It is well that the good man did not live to see himself and his faithful associates robbed and their character slandered by that very Government he was ready to lay down his life for. It would have been to him, as it is to me, the most mournful event of my life. . . .

DR. WHITMAN'S SUCCESSFUL MISSION AT WASHINGTON.

On reaching the settlements, Dr. Whitman found that many of the now old Oregonians—Waldo, Applegate, Hamtree, Keyser, and others—who had once made calculations to come to Oregon, had abandoned the idea because of the representations from Washington that every attempt to take wagons and ox teams through the Rocky Mountains and Blue Mountains to the Columbia had failed. Dr. Whitman saw at once what the stopping of wagons at Fort Hall every year meant. The representations purported to come from Secretary Webster but really from Governor Simpson, who, magnifying the statements of his chief trader, Grant, at Fort Hall, declared the Americans must be going mad, from their repeated fruitless attempts to take wagons and teams through the impassable regions of the Columbia, and that the women and children of those wild fanatics had been saved from a terrible death only by the repeated and philanthropic labors of Mr. Grant, at Fort Hall, in furnishing them with horses. The doctor told these men as he met them that his only object in crossing the mountains in the dead of the winter, at the risk of his life, and through untold sufferings, was to take back an American emigration that summer through the mountains to the Columbia with their wagons and teams. The route was practicable. We had taken our cattle and our families through several years before. They had nothing to fear; but to be ready on his return. The stopping of wagons at Fort Hall was a Hudson Bay Company scheme to prevent the settling of the country by Americans, till they could settle it [p. 21] with their own subjects from the Selkirk settlement. This news spread like fire through Missouri, as will be seen from Zacrey's statement. The doctor pushed on to Washington and immediately sought an interview with Secretary Webster—both being from the same State—and stated to him the object of his crossing the mountains, and laid before him the great importance of

Oregon to the United States. But Mr. Webster lay too near Cape Cod to see things in the same light with his fellow-statesman who had transferred his worldly interests to the Pacific coast. He awarded sincerity to the missionary, but could not admit for a moment that the short residence of six years could give the Doctor the knowledge of the country possessed by Governor Simpson, who had almost grown up in the country, and had traveled every part of it, and represents it as an unbroken waste of sand deserts and impassable mountains, fit only for the beaver, the gray bear and the savage. Besides, he had about traded it off with Governor Simpson, to go into the Ashburton treaty, for a cod-fishery on Newfoundland.

The doctor next sought, through Senator Linn, an interview with President Tyler, who at once appreciated his solicitude and his timely representations of Oregon, and especially his disinterested though hazardous undertaking to cross the Rocky Mountains in the winter to take back a caravan of wagons. He said that, although the doctor's representations of the character of the country, and the possibility of reaching it by wagon route, were in direct contradiction of those of Governor Simpson, his frozen limbs were sufficient proof of his sincerity, and his missionary character was sufficient guarantee for his honesty, and he would, therefore, as President, rest upon these and act accordingly ; would detail Frémont with a military force to escort the doctor's caravan through the mountains ; and no more action should be had toward trading off Oregon till he could hear the result of the expedition. If the doctor could establish a wagon route through the mountains to the Columbia River, pronounced impossible by Governor Simpson and Ashburton, he would use his influence to hold on to Oregon. The great desire of the doctor's American soul, Christian withal, that is, the pledge of the President that the swapping of Oregon with England for a cod-fishery should stop for the present, was attained, although at the risk of his life, and through great sufferings, and unsolicited, and without the promise or expectation of a dollar's reward from any source. And now God giving him life and strength, he would do the rest, that is, connect the Missouri and Columbia rivers with a wagon track so deep and plain that neither national envy nor sectional fanaticism would ever blot it out. And when the 4th of September, 1843, saw the rear of the doctor's caravan of nearly two hundred wagons with which he started from Missouri last of April emerge from the western shades of the Blue Mountains upon the plains of the Columbia, the greatest work was finished ever accomplished by one man for Oregon on this coast. And through that great emigration, during the whole summer, the doctor was their everywhere-present angel of mercy, ministering to the sick, helping the weary, encouraging the wavering, cheering the mothers, mending wagons, setting broken bones, hunting stray oxen ; climbing precipices, now in the rear, now in the center, now at the front ; in the rivers looking out fords through the quicksands, in the deserts looking out water ; in the dark mountains looking out passes ; at noontide or midnight, as though those

thousands were his own children, and those wagons and those flocks were his own property. Although he asked not and expected not a dollar as a reward from any source, he felt himself abundantly rewarded when he saw the desire of his heart accomplished, the great wagon route over the mountains established, and Oregon in a fair way to be occupied with American settlements and American commerce. And especially he felt himself doubly paid, when, at the end of his successful expedition, and standing alive at home again on the banks of the Walla-Walla, these thousands of his fellow summer pilgrims, wayworn and sunbrowned, took him by the hand and thanked him with tears for what he had done.

II.

Extract from the Memorial of H. H. Spalding to Congress entitled: American Congress vs. Protestantism in Oregon, Exec. Doc. 37, 41st Cong., third sess., p. 42.

And that said Whitman, by his sleepless vigilance became convinced that a deep-laid plan was about culminating to secure this rich country of Oregon Territory to Great Britain, from misrepresentation on the part of Great Britain and for want of information as to the character and value of the country on the part of the Government of the United States.

And that to prevent the sale and transfer of said Territory, and the consequent loss to the United States of this great Northwest and its valuable sea board, and the great commercial considerations therewith, said Whitman did, in the dead of winter, at his own expense, and without asking or expecting a dollar from any source, cross the continent, amid the snows of the Rocky Mountains and the bleakness of the intervening plains, inhabited by hostile savages, suffering severe hardships and perils from being compelled to swim broad, rapid, and ice-floating rivers, and to wander lost in the terrific snow-storms, subsisting on mule and dog meat, and reached the City of Washington not an hour too soon, confronting the British agents Ashburton, Fox, and Simpson, who, there is evidence to show, in a short time would have consummated their plans, and secured a part, if not all, of our territory west of the mountains to Great Britain, and by his own personal knowledge disproving their allegations, and by communicating to President Tyler important information concerning the country, and the fact that he had taken his wagons and mission families through years before, and that he proposed taking back a wagon-train of emigrants that season, did thereby prevent the sale and loss of this our rich Pacific domain to the people of the United States.

And that said Whitman did then return to Oregon Territory and conduct the first wagon-train of 1,000 souls to the Columbia River, thereby greatly increasing American influence, and completely breaking the influence of the British monopoly and adding immensely to the courage and wealth of the little American settlement.

DOCUMENTS

1. Diary of Samuel Cooper, 1775-1776.¹

SAMUEL COOPER, the writer of this diary, was one of the distinguished men of the American Revolution. Born in Boston, March 28, 1725, he was the second son and third child of the Rev. William Cooper,² by his wife Judith, daughter of Samuel Sewall, Chief Justice of the province. His grandmother, Mehetabel Cooper, "the woman," as Dr. Colman said on her death, "that one would have wished to be born of," was niece and coheir to Lieutenant-Governor Stoughton, her mother being a daughter of Israel Stoughton, lieutenant-colonel of Rainborowe's regiment, in the Parliamentary army. After completing his preparatory studies at the Public Latin School, he entered Harvard College, and was graduated thence in 1743, in the same class with James Otis. The year following he was called to the ministry, being chosen, despite his youth, to succeed his father, recently deceased, as associate pastor of the church in Brattle Street (by the Mathers stigmatized as the "Manifesto" Church), of which his grandfather, Thomas Cooper,² was a founder. On May 21, 1746, he was ordained, and at the death of his colleague, Dr. Colman, the next year, became pastor, and continued as such until his own death, December 29, 1783. He was a fellow of Harvard College from 1767 to 1783, and on the resignation of Dr. Locke was elected to the presidency, but declined the office, as his father had done thirty-seven years before on the death of President Wadsworth. From 1758 to 1770, and again from 1777 to 1783, he was chaplain to the General Court. One of the founders of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1780, he was its vice-president from that year until his death. In 1750 he received from Yale College the honorary degree of M.A., and in 1767 that of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh.

He was one of those to whom the confidential letters of Governor Hutchinson were shown; though from his own testimony, it

¹ The original diary is in the possession of Marvin M. Taylor, Esq., of Worcester, by whom it was kindly lent to me. His wife, the late Mrs. H. Emilie Taylor, was a lineal descendant of the writer.

² Some account of Dr. Cooper's family may be found in the *N. E. Hist. General Reg.*, XLIV. 53; XLIX. 385.

appears that they were not transmitted to him, as has repeatedly been affirmed. During the Revolution he was a frequent and powerful writer on the patriotic side; but, apart from sermons, letters, and a few political essays, there are no writings preserved, which can now be distinguished as his. "The characters the most conspicuous," writes John Adams¹ in 1818, "the most ardent and influential in the revival of American principles and feelings from 1760 to 1766 were, first and foremost, before all and above all, James Otis; next to him was Oxenbridge Thacher; next to him, Samuel Adams; next to him, John Hancock; then Dr. Mayhew; then Dr. Cooper and his brother."

"Dr. Cooper was a fine scholar. . . . He wrote with elegance, and his delivery was eloquent. He had a readiness of thought and flow of language, that gave him great command over his hearers, whether in the pulpit or in conversation. His manners were polished and courteous, and in the peculiar functions of his office he had great power to impress and to soothe. These qualifications secured to him the private affection and admiration of his parishioners; while his knowledge of the world, and the active part which he took in public affairs procured him the esteem and confidence of many eminent public characters."² "To his uncommon endowments," says Palfrey, "he joined an address and what is called a *talent for affairs*, which, if he had not been the leading divine, would perhaps have distinguished him as the most accomplished gentleman and adroit statesman of his country and time."

He married, September 11, 1746, Judith, only daughter of Dr. Thomas Bulfinch, a prominent physician of Boston. By her he had two daughters, one of whom married Gabriel Johonnot (often mentioned in the pages of the diary), and the other Joseph Sayer Hixon, of Montserrat.

There are several portraits of Dr. Cooper, some of which are by Copley. Beside those in the possession of his descendants, there are two belonging to the Massachusetts Historical Society. Another painting, evidently a Copley, was owned by the late Oliver Wendell Holmes. Yet another likeness hangs in Memorial Hall at Cambridge.

Dr. Cooper, as we learn from the diary and elsewhere,³ left

¹ *Works*, X. 284.

² Tudor, *Life of James Otis*, p. 151.

³ It appears that there were earlier leaves of this diary, now missing, from the following passage in the *History of Brattle Street Church*, by Lothrop, p. 102: "'On the 16th of April, 1775,' writes Dr. Cooper, in a journal, some fragments of which have been preserved and which I have been permitted to see [but which the present writer has failed to trace], 'the troubles in Boston increasing, and having received several menaces and

Boston shortly before the beginning of the siege, and did not return till after the evacuation. During this time he resided first at Weston, in the family of Samuel P. Savage, Esq., and afterwards at Waltham, where he supplied the pulpit, occasionally preaching in other towns and villages of Middlesex.

FREDERICK TUCKERMAN.

DIARY

19. [April 1775] *Wednesday*. wak'd by M^{rs} Savage¹ about 3 o Clock ; a large Detachment f'm General Gage's army was at Lexington marching for Concord—rose, and set off with Mrs Cooper, call'd upon B^r² and Sister Cooper at Park's, went to M^r Woodward's³: the Country round alarm'd—set out with th^m for Framingham. din'd at Buckminsters. went to M^r Stones at Sthboro. slept there and our Horses kept.

20. *Thursday*. Continu'd at M^r Stones' slept there Horses kept.

21. Return'd to Weston with B^r and Sister din'd at M^r Woodward's. After Dinner M^{rs} Cooper went with Master Hubbard towards Boston. I return'd to M^r Savage's slept there with M^r Conchlyn⁴ of Leicester M^{rs} Cooper slept at Mr Cushings.⁵ Horse kept there.

22. *Saturday*. I din'd with B^r and Sister Cooper at Parks my wife at M^r Savage's slept there. Horse kept.

insults, particularly at Mrs. Davis's from an officer, I left Boston by the advice of friends, and came with my wife to Mr. Savage's, at Weston, designing to ride in the country for the recruiting of my health, and to return to Boston in a few weeks, where I had left my dear child, all my plate, books, furniture, and so forth.'" "He was at Lexington," continues the authority just cited, "and dined with the Rev. Mr. Clarke, the minister, in company with Mrs. Hancock, the day before the battle." Cf. *Queries of George Chalmers, in Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, fourth series, IV. 371, 372.

¹ Samuel Phillips Savage (1718–1797) was moderator of the meeting at the Old South Church, which decided that the tea should not be landed. He was a delegate to the first Provincial Congress, president of the Massachusetts Board of War during the Revolution, and judge of the Court of Common Pleas for Middlesex. "He owned and occupied at this time the house standing on the Deacon Bigelow farm, so called, in the north part of Weston, near Daggett's corner." Drake, *History of Middlesex*, II. 496.

² William Cooper, an ardent and fearless patriot, whose name is found attached to nearly all the Boston papers of the Revolution. Born in Brookline, October 1, 1721, he was educated at the Boston Public Latin School, and in early life became a merchant. After filling various offices, he was chosen in 1761 town clerk, in his brother's meeting-house, and re-elected annually for forty-nine years. During the war he was a member and clerk of the Committee of Correspondence, and in 1775 secretary of the Committee of Safety. He was several times a member of the House, and its speaker *pro tem.* during two sessions. From 1759 to 1799 he was register of probate for Suffolk. Very active in the affairs of the town and province, he served on many important committees, drafted many of the town documents of the Revolutionary period, and was a frequent writer in the public prints. He married, April 25, 1745, Katharine, daughter of Colonel Jacob Wendell, a merchant and member of the Council, and had issue eight sons and seven daughters. He died in Boston, November 28, 1809, aged 88.

³ The Rev. Samuel Woodward (H.C. 1748), minister of Weston.

⁴ The Rev. Benjamin Conklin (Coll. N.J. 1755), minister of Leicester.

⁵ The Rev. Jacob Cushing, D.D. (H.C. 1748), minister of Waltham.

23. *Lord's day.* Confin'd at M^r Savages by Weather and Indisposition. Horse kept.

24. *Monday.* Went with B^r Cooper to Watertown. din'd at Brewers, saw Dispatch¹ f'm Hartford. slept at M^r Savages. Horse kept there.

25. Went with M^{rs} Cooper towards Boston to be near at Hand in Case the Inhabitants s'd have Leave f'm Gen^l Gage to quit the Town wch had been shut up since last Thursday: found no Communication between Boston and the Country. din'd at M^r John Dennies² at little Cambridg.³ return'd to M^r Savages, saw in the Way vast Number of our Militia marching in from the western Parts, slept at M^r Savages. Horse kept for first Night at Deacon Russell's.

Wednesday 26. Went in my Chaise to Cambridg, din'd at D^r Appleton's⁴ M^r Hill and M^r How came to see me there, bro't me a Letter f'm Gov' Pownall and another f'm D^r Franklin. Went to the Committee of Safety. communicated D. [r] F.'s Letter, saw General Ward⁵ paid transient Comps to Him and Committee. heard on my return that D^r Bond⁶ of Marblehead was apprehended for giving false Intelligence to Salem and Marblehead &c Forces by wc'h they were delay'd coming up to the Fight⁷ on Wednesday. Slept at M^r Savages. Horse at Deacon Russell's. Boston still shut up. my dear Nabby⁸ there, no communication. Reports that the Inhabitants were promis'd Liberty to leave the Town with their Effects upon giving up their Arms, that many had done so, but all still shut up. Reports also that the Forces from the Country wanting to be led immediately on to action began to grow uneasy.

Thursday 27. Went with M^{rs} Cooper in my chaise to Cambridg, both din'd at President Langdon's,⁹ return'd to M^r Savages p.m. slept there. Horse at D. Russell's.

Friday 28. At M^r Savages, din'd there. Went with M^{rs} Cooper to visit Sister C. at Park's. I visited Neighbors Fisk. Fuller. Osmore. Ephraim Parks. slept at M^r Savages. Horse at Russels

Sat. 29. Saturday. My Wife went to Cambridg with B^r Cooper in my Chaise. She took a Boy there and proceeded to Roxbury: to try

¹ See *Journ. Prov. Cong. Mass.*, p. 151, and note.

² John Dennie, a prominent merchant and loyalist.

³ The southerly part of Cambridge, afterwards incorporated as the town of Brighton.

⁴ The Rev. Nathaniel Appleton, D.D. (H.C. 1712), for more than sixty-six years minister of Cambridge, and for nearly as long a fellow of the Corporation. He was the second person honored by the college with the degree of D.D., Increase Mather having been the first.

⁵ Artemas Ward, whose name stands first on the list of major-generals appointed by the Continental Congress, June 17, 1775. He had already been appointed by the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts commander of all the forces raised by that colony.

⁶ Nathaniel Bond (H.C. 1766), surgeon of the 14th Continental regiment, who was charged before the Committee of Safety "with having acted an unfriendly part to this colony." The charges were not sustained. See *Journ. Prov. Cong. Mass.*, p. 555.

⁷ At Lexington and Concord.

⁸ His daughter, Abigail.

⁹ The Rev. Samuel Langdon, D.D., sometime minister of Portsmouth, N. H., and from 1774 to 1780 president of Harvard College.

if She c'd bring Nabby f'm Boston. She went to the Guards on the Neck. Cap't Shee of the Regulars obligingly offerr'd to carry a Billet to Nabby, told her he saw her well the day before. Nabby received the Billet that Evg. desiring her to be at Roxbury next Day if she could get out of Boston. I went to Cambridg a.m. din'd with M^{rs} Hill Quincy &c at Professor Wigglesworth's,¹ return'd by Sunset. M^{rs} Cooper return'd after 9 o Clock. Horse at Mr. Savages: being too late to send it to Russell's.

30. *Lord's day.* M^{rs} Cooper went to Roxbury for Nabby. I pch'd for M^r Woodward a. m. he pray'd. Din'd with him, as did Mr. Savage. I pray'd p. m. He pch'd. M^r Woodward pray'd for my Daughter's Deliverance, return'd to Mr. Savages at 6 o Clock. M^{rs} Cooper just arriv'd there with Nabby. Horse at D. Russell's Nabby and Katy slept with us at Mr. Savages

1. *May. Monday.* Mrs. Cooper went wth Sister Cooper to Charlestown, they din'd at M^r Carys. sent Billets by Hopkins the Ferriman for our Trunks. met M^r Payne of Boston, a Message f'm him to me. return'd in Evening. I went with M^r Savage a. m. to Capt Whittemore's, and Mr Woodward's, din'd at Mr Savages. went with him p. m. to M^r Cushing's. Waltham. Katy and Nabby, my Wife and I, slept at Mr Savages: Horse at D. Russells

2. *May. Tuesday.* Sat out in the Morning with M^{rs} Cooper for charlestown. din'd at M^r Carys, receiv'd our Trunks f'm Boston with Brothers children, went to Medford. Drank Coffee with Deacon Smith's Lady at M^r Bishop's. slept at M^r Turell's.² Horse kept there. Nabby and Katy at M^r Savage's.

3. *Wednesday.* visited M^{rs} Smith and M^r Payne and Family at Brook's. went about 11 o'Clock to Cambridg by Menotomy.³ saw the Houses and Barns that had suffer'd in the Battle. Lt. Hull, a British officer died of his Wounds just as we pass'd the House where he lay. Mrs. Cooper din'd at Mr. Wigglesworth's. I din'd at Hastings with committee of Safety. News confirm'd that N. York had Secur'd all King's Troops and Stores, &c drank Coffee at John Harrington's. He kindly gave us a Bottle of Metheglin.⁴ Slept at M^r Savage's. Horse at D. Russell's. Nabby and Katy at M^r Savage's.

4. *Thursday.* My Wife and Nabby went to Cambridg and Charlestown in my chaise. I visited Sister Cooper at Park's. call'd at Dan! Parks'. went f'm thence on Foot to M^r Inches at D' Russell's House. din'd there. call'd at Sister Cooper's after dinner Katy at Mr Savages all day. Slept at Mr Savage's. Katy and Nabby at Joseph Russells Horse kept at D. Russell's.

¹ The Rev. Edward Wigglesworth, D.D. (H. C. 1749), Hollis Professor of Divinity.

² The Rev. Ebenezer Turell (H. C. 1721), second minister of Medford. His life of Benjamin Colman is pronounced by Quincy, "the best biography extant of any native of Massachusetts written during its provincial state." *Hist. Harv. Univ.*, II. 78.

³ The Second Parish in Cambridge; later West Cambridge, now Arlington.

⁴ Mead, a strong liquor made of honey and water fermented and flavored.

Friday, May 5. Carried Nabby in my chaise 10 ° Clock a. m. to M^r Woodward's. He not being at home rode with her towards Framingham. oated at Reeve's Tavern gratis. return'd to Mr Woodward's. we din'd there. Katy and Mrs Cooper at Savages. return'd by Parks'. found Mrs Cooper there. Katy walk'd over to Mr Woodward's slept with Nabby there. My wife and I at M^r Savages. A Travailer f'm Hartford inform'd me this Day, that Connecticut had voted an Army of 6,000. Worcester¹ 1st Officer, Spencer next. Putnam 3^d. heard also a Report that the N. Yorkers had taken a King's Vessel² with a large Sum of Money after a bloody Engagement. D^r Prescott³ of Groton visited me this Morning and propos'd my Supplying their Pulpit, propos'd to Mr Woodward his going there and that I w'd supply his Pulpit wch He c'd not comply with. Horse at D. Russells.

Saturday. 6th M^r and M^{rs} Hyde call'd upon us early this Mornng. He and my Wife sat out in my chaise about 10. for charlestown to try if we could bring Part of our Furniture from Boston. I din'd at M^r Savage's. M^{rs} Cooper at Charlestown. She return'd in the Evening. we slept at Mr Savages. Horse at Russell's

Lord's day 7. May. Went to publick Worship at Weston. heard Mr. Cushing both Parts of the Day. we din'd at Mr. Woodward's. my Horse at Josiah Smith's gratis. saw Mrs Jackson of Boston and her Son there p. m. going to N. Haven. Slep't at Mr Savages. Horse at Russell's.

Monday 8th. Cloudy and small Rain. We Din'd at M^r Savages. I bro't Nabby and Katy p.m. from M^r Woodward's to M^r Joseph Russell's agreed for them both at 1 Doll. p'r Week. slept at M^r Savage's. Horse at Russell's.

Tuesday. 9. Went with M^{rs} Cooper in my chaise to Brooklyne. Maj^r Thompson's Wife brot her a boy to carry her to the Lines, where She saw her Brother,⁴ found he was unable to procure our Furniture f'm Boston ; I walk'd to Mrs. Hyslop's. din'd there with D^r Chauncy⁵ and Lady : Col. Quincy, Deacon Jeffries and Lady. saw Mr. Hunt, Mr Hill and M^{rs} Quincy. Rumor that the Troops were likely to make a Sally f'm Boston. return'd to Mr. Savages, stop'd by the Way at M^{rs} William's Waltham, saw Mrs Gill who had with great Difficulty got out of Boston. slept at Mr. Savage's. Horse at Russell's.

Wednesday. Went in my chaise and Mr S^r's Horse to the Lines at Roxbury. I stopt at the George Tavern on Boston Neck. Mrs Cooper

¹ David Wooster, commander of the Connecticut forces ; afterwards appointed by the Continental Congress a brigadier-general.

² "Two sloops which lay at the wharves laden with flour and supplies for the British at Boston, of the value of eighty thousand pounds, were speedily unloaded." Bancroft, *History*, edit. 2, VII. 328.

³ Oliver Prescott (H. C. 1750), a noted physician, and brother of Colonel William Prescott. From 1777 to 1779 he sat in the Council of Massachusetts.

⁴ Dr. Thomas Bulfinch (H. C. 1746), of Boston, an eminent physician and the father of Charles Bulfinch, the architect.

⁵ The Rev. Charles Chauncy, D.D. (H. C. 1721), from 1727 to 1787 minister of the First Church in Boston.

met D^r Bulfinch on the Lines. we din'd at Mr Pierpoints¹ Roxbury. drank Coffee at Mr Hall's Watertown. slept at Mr Savages. Horse at Russell's.

Thursday 11th Fast day. I went to Lincoln Meeting. saw Mr Green, Call and Families at Mr. Adam's. Mr. Lawrence pray'd and pch'd a. m. prepare to meet thy God o Israel. spent Interval at Mr Lawrence's. I pray'd p.m. Mr. L. pch'd. supp'd with him. Mrs. Cooper not abroad. Slept at M^r S. Horse at Russell's.

Friday 12. Went with M^{rs} Cooper in my Chaise to little Cambridg. Din'd with Mr Dennie. He gave me a Variety of Seed ; I gave some to Mr Savage and the rest to J. Russell. went p. m. to old Cambridg. stop't at Congress at Watertown : found them engag'd on the Point of a new Governm't.² drank Tea at Waltham with M^{rs} Gill at her Lodgings. Mr. Edward Green and Lady there. Slept at Savages. Horse Russell's.

Saturday. 13. May. Went to Concord with Mr Savage. call'd at Mr Hubbard's: f'm thence to Mr. Emerson's.³ He was abroad, engag'd to pch for him on the Morrow, while he was to supply Groton. return'd to M^r Savages, we din'd there. we went with M^{rs} Savage Sister Cooper to Nabby's chamber drank Coffee. Slept at Savages ; Horse at Russell's.

Lord's day. 14. Went to Concord with Nabby. put my Horse at M^r Hubbard's. found to my Surprize M^r. Emerson at the Meeting House Door. He pray'd I pch'd a. m. f'm, the Consolation of Israel. We din'd at Mr Emerson's. with Mr. Knox and Wife of Boston. I pray'd Mr Emerson pch'd p. m. we drank Coffee at M^r Hubbards. slept at Mr. Savages. Horse at Russell's.

Monday 15th My Wife and Daughter went to Medford in my Chaise. din'd at M^r Turell's. drank Tea at Mrs. Hunts Watertown. I din'd at Mr. S. drank Coffee at Sister Cooper's. My Wife and Nabby return'd in th^e Evg. slept at Mr. S. Horse at Russell's.

Tuesday May 16. Went with M^r Savage, his Horse and chaise to see Mrs Greenleaf at Waltham, din'd with Gen^l Ward call'd at Mr Hall's Watertown, saw Mr Cook and Mr John Greenleaf. slept at Mr. S. Horse at R.

Wednesday. 17. Went with M^{rs} Cooper in my Chaise to see Mad^m Foyes⁴ Family and M^r Bowdoin.⁵ call'd at Deacon Tudors at little Cambridg. treated with a Glass of Wine and Gingerbread. din'd with

¹ Robert Pierpont, a merchant, and member of the Boston Committee of Correspondence.

² "Whether there is now existing in this colony a necessity of taking up, and exercising the powers of civil government." *Jour. Prov. Cong. Mass.*, p. 219.

³ The Rev. William Emerson (H. C. 1761), minister of Concord, and chaplain at Ticonderoga, where he died in 1776. He was the grandfather of Ralph Waldo Emerson.

⁴ Elizabeth Foye, daughter of John Campbell, proprietor of the Boston *News Letter*. She married William Foye, a member of the Council and for many years treasurer of the Province, and had Mary, who married the Rev. William Cooper (his second wife), and had Mary, who married Dr. Samuel Gardner (H. C. 1746), of Milton, and left issue.

⁵ James Bowdoin, LL.D., F.R.S., afterwards governor of Massachusetts.

his Son in Law ¹ and Daughter Savage at M^{rs} Thompson's, at little Cambridge. Major Thompson at Connecticut on publick Service. Went to the Lines, but c'd not find D^r Bulfinch as we hop'd. visited M^r Bowdoin at M^{rs} Bowman's of Dorchester. found him extremely low with a Lung Fever. He had met with gt Difficulty in getting out of Boston. The Admiral [Graves] had refus'd a Pass to the Vessel he had provided for himself and some Necessaries, to Elizabeth Island. I pray'd with him. went to M^{rs} Foyes at Milton. met M^{rs} Jones; promis'd f'm her an easy chair for M^r Bowdoin, M^{rs} Bowman having remov'd her own Furniture. drank Coffee at Sister Gardiner's. slept and Horse kept at Mad^m Foyes. The first Visit after the Death of dear Mother Cooper.² Saw as we were going to Bed a great Fire in Boston.

Thursday. 18. Breakfast at M^m Foyes. Call'd at M^r Jones. She has sent at my Desire the easy Chair and Mad^m Foye another. call'd at M^r Bowdoin's. found him a little reliev'd but still dangerous. wrote to D^r Bulfinch about my Servants and Books and Furniture in Boston. heard that our Meeting House and a great Number of Houses around it were burnt. came to Head Quarters at Roxbury: found that the Fire³ had consum'd many Stores on the South Side the Swing Bridge, the whole Loss computed at 20 000 Sterling. the General had before taken all the Engines under his Order. The Inhabitants were not allow'd to work at the Fire in the Begining; and the Souldiers knew not how to manage in such a Case with their Dexterity. Din'd at M^{rs} Hyslop's, with D^r Chauncy and Lady; M^r Hunt, M^r Adams &c. drank Coffee at Capt Segars at little Cambridge. invited in there as we came along by our dear Friends M^r and M^{rs} Scott and her Sister Sally, whom we saw with Pleasure out of Boston. slept at M^r S. Horse at R.

Friday. 19th May. about 10 o Clock saw our good Friends at M^r Savages in their Way to Princetown. they left us at eleven. We din'd at M^r Savages. Drank Coffee at Sister Cooper's. slept at S. Horse at Russell's.

Saturday. din'd at M^r S. slept there Horse at Russell's.

Lora's day. 21. May. pch'd all day at Concord M^r Emerson for me at Groton. din'd at his house. drank Coffee at Sister Coopers with B^r. slep't at Mr. S. Horse at Russell's.

Monday 22 Rainy day din'd at M^r S. slept there. Horse at Russell's.

Tuesday 23 Went in my chaise in the Morning to Watertown. din'd at M^{rs} Storer's. drank Coffee at M^{rs} Edward Greens Mrs Cooper at Mr. S. all day. slept there. Horse at Russell's.

Wednesday 24th. Went with my Chaise and Nabby to Cambridge. din'd at Mr Dennies. went to Head Quarters. M^{rs} Cooper din'd at M^r S. Slept there Horse at R.

¹ Habijah Savage, the father of James Savage, the distinguished antiquary.

² Mary (Foye) Cooper, step-mother of the diarist, who died at Milton in April, 1774.

³ Cf. Diary of John Tudor, p. 55; Diary of John Rowe, in *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.*, second series, X. 92.

Thursday 25 We din'd at Mr Savages. M^r Wadsworth and Gill with us. after dinner M^{rs} C. and Nabby went to Concord drank Coffee at M^r Betons. slept at S. Horse at Russells.

26. We Din'd at Cap't Baldwin's with Sister Cooper. and drank Coffee. Slept at S. Horse at R.

May 27. Saturday. Sat out in the Morn^g. 8 ° Clock in my Chaise for Groton, bated at White's of Acton din'd at M^{rs} Newman of Lyttleton. drank Coffee with M^r Rogers¹ reach'd Groton at Sunset; Slept and Horse kept at D^r Prescott's.

28. *Lord's day.* Pch'd all day at Groton; spoke with M^r Dana after Service a.m. din'd at D^r Prescott's baptiz'd a child P.M. slept and Horse kept at D^r Prescott's. a brave Action of our Army this day at Noddle's and Hog Islands.²

29. *Monday* Sat out fm Groton ° Clock. stop'd at M^r Hall's Wesford. saw M^{rs} Gray and Family there. proceeded to chalmersford. din'd at Col Stoddard's call'd at M^r Bridge's. he absent. went p.m. to M^r Cummin's³ of Billerica, saw M^{rs} Mountford, Miss chandler Stoddard, Polly Turner, and other Boston friends. drank Coffee slept and Horse kept there.

30. *Tuesday.* sat out f'm M^r Cummins 8 ° Clock. a great Discharge of Guns f'm towards Boston for more than an Hour had alarm'd the Country, call'd at Mr Pennyman's of Bedford. saw Molly Williams and her mother f'm Boston, bated Horse. proceeded to Concord, from thence to Mr Savages, din'd there and drank Coffee Sister Cooper and Nabby with us. Slept there. Horse at Russell's. found the Firing to be only a mock Fight of the Regulars at Boston.

31. *Wednesday.* Went in my chaise with Nabby to Watertown, heard President Langdon preach before the Congress a well adapted Sermon. as great a Number of Ministers as usual on Election day. They din'd by Invitation of the Congress at Coolidge's Tavern. handsomely entertained. D^r Warren President of the Congress attended the Ministers most obligingly, and did the Honors of the Table. They form'd a Convention immediately after dinner, chose former Scribe⁴ and Treasurer. M^r Parkman⁵ Moderator. voted no Collection. chose Myself, M^r Cook, Shute, Bridg, Williams a Committee to draft an Address to the Congress, testifying our Respect and Confidence, and offering to supply the Army with Chaplains f'm our own Number without Stipend.⁶ Address accepted and presented. Mrs Cooper din'd at Savages, and drank

¹ Probably the Rev. Daniel Rogers (H.C. 1725), for half a century minister of Littleton.

² Noddle's Island, now East Boston; Hog Island, otherwise known as Breed's Island. For an account of this affair see *Diary of John Tudor*, pp. 55-57; *Journal of Timothy Newell*, in *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, fourth series, I. 262; *Diary of Ezekiel Price*, in *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 1863-64, p. 186.

³ The Rev. Henry Cuming, D.D. (H.C. 1760), minister of Billerica.

⁴ The Rev. Amos Adams (H. C. 1752), minister of Roxbury.

⁵ The Rev. Ebenezer Parkman (H. C. 1721), first minister of Westborough.

⁶ See *Journ. Prov. Cong. Mass.*, pp. 283, 284, 290.

Coffee at Sister Cooper's Lodgings. Slept at S. Horse at Russell's. I din'd with Ministers. Nabby at Mr Hall's.

June 1. Went 8 ° Clock with Nabby in my Chaise to Watertown, at wch Time divine Service of Convention begun, and was over wn I reachd Watertown. M^r Stevens¹ pch'd. went to Convention at Cool-idg's. I drafted a Vote respecting Chaplains, as I did the Address yesterday, din'd at Fowl's with M^r John Pitts² &c Nabby at M^m Hunts. I visited p. m. Mrs Wendell, Mrs. Phillips and Family. Nabby drank Coffee at Mrs Hall's. slept at S. Horse at Russell's.

2. Friday. Din'd at M^r Savages. Visited with M^{rs} Cooper M^r Lawrence and Family p. m. found on my Return home M^r Coburn and Wife, who slept with us. Horse at Russell's.

3. Saturday. At home din'd at M^r Savages. M^{rs} Savage, Ray, Melvill &c drank Coffee with us at Nabbys Room Slept at Savages. Horse at Russell's.

4. Pch'd at Weston both parts of the day M^r Woodward at Watertown. M^r Thaxter³ for me at Weston. We dind with Nabby at M^r Woodward's. Horse kept all day at M^r Josiah Smith's. return'd after Service p. m. to M^r S. B^r and Sister Cooper and Nabby drank Coffee, and supp'd with us. Slept at M^r S. Horse at Russell's.

5. Monday. Went with M^{rs} Cooper in my chaise to Billerica: call'd at M^r Lawrence's and Pennyman's. last not at home. din'd with Col Thompson at Billerica. drank Coffee with M^r Green and Family. at Lincoln, slept at S. Horse at R.

6. Tuesday. We din'd at home. Went with my Wife in our chaise and Nabby and M^{rs} Melvill to M^r Inches drank Coffee slept at S. Horse at R.

7. Went after Breakfast in my chaise with my Wife to Holliston. bated at Gleason's Framingham. went thro a woody Romantic Way to M^r Prentiss's in all 20 Miles. Dind at his House with our dear Friends Capt and Mrs Freeman. slept and Horse kept there.

8. Din'd at Mr Prentiss' with our Friends. sat out early after Dinner. came a shorter and smoother way than we went, bated at Gleason's. drank Coffee at Capt How's at Weston by whom and Mrs How we were most obligingly invited and kind[l]y treated. found at my Return home M^r Beton of Concord had sent me a fine Leg of Pork. slept at S. Horse at R.

9. Friday. We din'd at home; Nabby with us, on M^r Beton's fine Leg of Pork roasted &c Paid M^r Savage in full for our Board to this Day; deducting whole days w'n both of us were absent; but not single Dinners. Slept at S. Horse at Russell's.

10. Saturd: Advanc'd to M^r. Joseph Russell 7 Dollars. Went in my chaise after Breakfast with M^{rs} Cooper to Billerica. call'd at M^r

¹ Presumably the Rev. Benjamin Stevens, D. D. (H. C. 1740), of Kittery.

² John Pitts (H. C. 1757), a merchant of Boston, delegate to the Provincial Congress and afterwards a member of the Council.

³ Probably the Rev. Joseph Thaxter (H. C. 1768), chaplain of Colonel Prescott's regiment, and afterwards minister of Edgartown.

Lawrence Door. din'd at M^r. Pennyman's. Left my Horse in his Pasture, by his offer and took his in my chaise. Drank Coffee at Mr. Cummins slept and Horse kept there.

11. *Lord's d.* Pch'd all day at Billerica, baptiz'd i. din'd and slept at M^r Cummins. Visited in the Evg by Col Thompson and D^r Danforth. M^r Cummins pch'd for me at Groton. He sat out on Saturday before I arriv'd, and return'd home this Evening.

12. *Monday.* Breakfasted at M^r Cummin's. call'd at Mr Pennyman's of Bedford took back my own Horse. din'd at Capt Smiths of Lincoln on a roasted Turkey. call'd at M^r Lawrence's and Green's Door p. m. drank Coffee with Sister Cooper; met there Cos^a Jacob and Wife. slept at S. Horse at Russell's.

13. *Tuesday.* We Went with my Horse and chaise to M^r Woodward's. Association Meeting. an agreeable day. M^{rs} Cooper din'd at M^{rs} Baldwin's. She went with her p. m. to Newton and visited Nabby and Betsy Bulfinch. I walk'd home in the Evg. M^{rs} Cooper return'd in the chaise. slept at S. Horse at Russell's. Nabby sat off with Mr. Scot's Serv't Richard in his chaise for Princetown after Breakfast.

14. Went with my Wife with my Horse and Chaise after Breakfast to Medford. din'd with M^r Payne's Family at their Lodgings at Brook's. Mrs

[A part of the Diary is here missing]

M^r Lowell spent Evg and slept with us at S. Horse at R.

23. [*June*] We sat out with my Horse and chaise after Breakfast. went thro Lincoln and Bedford to Billerica. din'd at M^r Stern's. call'd at Brother Cummins. slept at M^r Bridg's Chelmsford. Horse there.

24. Went a. m. to Dunstable din'd at M^r Pitts'. slept and Horse there. Visited p. m. by James Ting¹ Dr. Loring etc.

25. *Lord's day.* I pch'd both Parts of the Day at Dunstable. din'd at M^r Pitts'. read p. m. Proclamation fm Provincial Congress for reviving Observation of the Sabbath. spoke after reading it 7 or 8 Minutes extempore. Hon^l M^r Russell and Family, Capt Henley, John Winslow, and Tho^s Russell and Families attended divine Service. Drank Coffee with M^r Pitts and Family at Col. John Tyng's. slept at M^r Pitts. Horse there.

26. *Monday.* return'd to Chelmsford. din'd at Col. Stoddard's. met there Capt. Winslow. Col Stoddard and Lady kindly accompanied us over Carlston's Bridg to Tewksbury in our Way to Andover. Visited in the last Place Mr Appleton's Family. He at Cambridg. met there Capt Bradford and Wife. drank Coffee, slept, and Horse there.

27. *Tuesday.* M^r Abbott and Wife visited us this Morn^g. Went with us to M^r Halls and Families. to Dr. Winthrop² and Ladies Lodgings:

¹James Tyng and Colonel John Tyng, *infra* (H. C. 1725), of Dunstable, were both delegates to the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts.

²John Winthrop, LL.D., F.R.S. (H. C. 1732), Hollis Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy at Harvard College, a fellow of the Corporation, and a member of the Council of Massachusetts.

where we saw M^r Tom Winthrop. M^{rs} Phillips and Daughter. visited Brother Trench. met there brother Holt. call'd at M^r Phillips Jun^r saw M^{rs}. Noyes and her Sister Mad^m Bromfield and Daughter. Din'd at Brother Symme's:¹ receiv'd in a most obliging Manner by him and Family and Billy Powell and Wife who lodg there: their Daughter entertain'd us with her Voice and Harpsicord. went p. m. to Rowley. call'd at Mr Chandler's. Drank Coffee at Mr Parsons² of Byfield, with Judg Trowbridg.³ went to Dummer School. saw dear little Sammy⁴ well. slept and Horse there.

28. *Wednesday.* Hir'd an Horse of Mr Hale, went with Sammy to N. Port.⁵ bought cloaths for him. call'd at Mr Greenleaf's, Carters, Capt Tracy's, M^r Ellis Gray and Mother and Family. call'd at Ruth Mawgridg's Lodgings saw her well. met Capt Gray's Wife. return'd. din'd at Dummer School. sat out for Ipswich. call'd there at M^{rs} Andrews Lodgings. found her sick of a Fever pray'd with her. slept and Horse at Br. Dana's.⁶

29. *Thursday.* Detain'd by Rain there. visited M^r Story and Family. His son the Minister and Wife being there. M^{rs} Story the Elder ill, and had buried a Daughter yesterday pray'd with the Family. Coffee at Br. Dana's. Slept and Horse there.

30. *Friday.* Left Br Dana's after Breakfast. Call'd at M^r Hitchcock's Beverly: he abroad. din'd at Mr wm Davis at Danvers. slept at M^r Turell's Medford. Horse there.

July 1. Went early to visit M^{rs} Newell and Payne's Family. at M^r Brook's: not at home. proceeded for Groton. bated at Hartwell's gratis. Din'd at D^r Lee's: Concord. His son obligingly accompanied us towards Lyttleton. Coffee at M^{rs} Newman's. slept there. Horse at M^r Tuthill's gratis.

2. *Lord's day.* Went early to Groton after Breakfast. pch'd all day. read Proclamation from Continental Congress for a Fast thro all the Colonies⁷ and f'm Pr. Congress respecting Sabbath. spoke extempore a few minutes upon the last. Din'd. Coffee, slept, and Horse at Dr Prescotts.

¹ The Rev. William Symmes, D.D. (1750), sometime tutor in Harvard College, and minister of Andover.

² The Rev. Moses Parsons (H. C. 1736), minister of Byfield parish in Newbury, and father of Theophilus Parsons, chief justice of Massachusetts.

³ Edmund Trowbridge (H. C. 1728), Judge of the Superior Court of Judicature of the Province. He was one of the judges at the trial of Capt. Preston and others concerned in the Boston massacre. Though attached to the royal government he did not approve of all its measures, and in 1772 resigned his office and retired to private life.

⁴ Samuel Cooper Johonnot (H. C. 1783), a grandson of the diarist, and bred to the law. In 1793 he was appointed consul of the United States at Demerara, where he died in 1806.

⁵ Newburyport.

⁶ The Rev. Joseph Dana, D.D. (Yale Coll. 1760), for more than sixty years minister of Ipswich.

⁷ *Journ. Prov. Cong. Mass.*, pp. 342, 392, 393, note.

3. *Monday.* Visited by Capt Sartell D^r Prescott had my Horse shoed at his own Expence. Came by Mistake the Westford Road to Concord. Din'd at Chamberlain's Tavern. Coffee at M^r Emersons, with M^r Far-
rar, M^{rs} Dunn and Dickman call'd at Sister Cooper's. slept at S. Hor[s]e
at R.

4. *Tuesday.* Din'd at home. bought 500^{lbs} of Hay of James
Adams. Sister Cooper and Cousin Judy drank Coffee with us. Slept at
Savages Horse at Russell's.

5. *Wednesday.* Went in my Horse and chaise with Mrs Cooper to
Cambridg. She din'd with Stuart Hastings.¹ I waited on General
Washington, Lee, Major Miffling², Reed³, &c din'd with General Wash-
ington, the other Gentlemen, Ward Ward, Putnam &c. Went p. m. to
the Lines at Prospect Hill.⁴ Saw the Encampment of the British Troops
on Bunkers Hill. drank Coffee with M^{rs} Newell, Mr. Payne and Family.
Supped and slept at M^r Turells with M^r Rogers of Exeter, and M^r Pool's
Daughters. Horse there.

6. *Thursday.* Went after Breakfast to Mr Payne's; spent an Hour
there with our Friends: proceeded down Menotomy Road to Cambridg.
Went to Major Johonnots⁵ Quarters, my Wife din'd there. I din'd at
Stuart Hasting's. Call'd at the Room of Committee of Safety, and con-
vers'd with them. met at Maj^r Johonnets' Quarters Col Bowers and Lady.
call'd at Congress. Receiv'd Letters from John and Sam^l Adams and
M^r Cushing bro't by General Washington. slept at Savages. Horse for
the first night at M^r Hagar's.

7. *Friday.* We din'd at M^r Savage's. Hir'd an Horse of Mr Bige-
low for our Chaise. M^{rs} Cooper went with Mr Harry Savage after Din-
ner to see Abby at Princetown. She Slept at Mad^m Gardiners of Stow.
I wrote Letters to Messrs Adams, Hancock, Cushing, Dr Franklin,
Madam Hancock. Slept at Savages. Horse at Hagar's.

8. *Saturday.* Finishd my Letters din'd and slept at Savages. Mrs
Cooper reach'd M^r Scotts at Princetown about 3 o Clock. She slept
there and had the Pleasure of finding our dear Daughter and good Friends
well there.

9. Attend'd divine Service at Weston. din'd with my Wife at
M^r Woodward's. I pray'd p. m. slept at S. Horse at Hagars.

10. *Monday.* Extreme hot. I din'd at S. rode p. m. on my Horse
to M^r Inche's. M^{rs}. C. sat out from Princetown with M^r Harry Savage
between 5 and 6 o Clock. They din'd at M^r Goss' : Bolton ; and arriv'd

¹ Jonathan Hastings (H. C. 1730), from 1750 to 1779 steward of the College.

² Thomas Mifflin, of Pennsylvania, *aide-de-camp* to General Washington ; afterwards
major-general in the American army, president of Congress, and governor of Pennsylva-
nia.

³ Joseph Reed, of Pennsylvania, aid and secretary to General Washington ; afterwards
brigadier-general, member of Congress, and president of Pennsylvania.

⁴ Washington to the President of Congress, July 10; in Sparks, III. 17.

⁵ Gabriel Jonhonnott, son-in-law of Dr. Cooper. He was lieutenant-colonel of the
14th Continental regiment, otherwise known as the Marblehead regiment, commanded
by Colonel John Glover.

at M^r Savage's between 10 and eleven in the Evg: where we slept. my Horse at Hagar's: Hir'd Horse at Savages Barn.

11. Spent the Day at home, where we slept. extreme hot. Horse at Hagars.

12. *Wednesday.* Went with M^{rs} Cooper in our Horse and chaise, in Company with M^r and M^{rs} Savage to Cambridg: my Wife din'd with them at Stuart Hastings Table. I din'd with the Committee of Safety. among other good Dishes an excellent corn'd Cod. Soon after Dinner a very Severe Storm of Thunder, and plenteous Rain. after the Rain, waited on General Washington, Lee, &c. gave my Letters to Friends at Philadelphia to the Care of Secretary Reed. Return'd and reach'd home about 9 o Clock. Slept at S. Horse at Hagars.

13. *Thursday.* Sat out with Mrs Cooper in our own chaise and Horse for Holliston. Call'd at Brother Woodward's—not at home—at M^r Dunbars—not at home. stop'd and cool'd and refresh'd my Self at Farmer Hastings': the Woman at home and very hospitable. din'd at M^r Demings of Needham. saw there Mr Clough of Boston, and Mrs Edes of Charlestown. met M^r Benj^a Eustis and Daughter, and Daughter of Widow West, who inform'd me her Mother died about a Fortnight ago at Waltham. Call'd at M^r S. Well's, Natick. saw his Wife and Brother Arnold. Call'd at M^r Badgers,¹ at Capt Newell's, Sherburn. saw him and Family, Miss Sarah Jackson. M^r Ezek^l Hall and Lady: who treated me with a Glass of Dorchester Ale. Call'd at President Lockes,² saw him and Lady and Professor Sewall's Lady. arriv'd before Sunset at M^r Prentice's. Found Capt Freeman and Lady and all our good Friends well. Much fatigued with Riding and Heat, having come about 20 Miles.

14. *Friday.* Still fatigued and unwell, tho most kindly receiv'd by our very dear and obliging Friends the Capt. and M^{rs}. Freeman at their own Apartments. pass'd the day most agreeably with them. saw Mr Brown of Sherburn p. m. rode about an Hour with Capt Freeman in his Chaise. slept and Horse there.

15. *Saturday.* Din'd at Capt Freemans Lodgings. Drank Coffee with their Neighbor Newton.

16. *Lord's day.* pch'd a. m. for M^r Prentiss, and pray'd. He pray'd p. m. I pch'd.

17. *Monday.* visited with Capt Freeman and Lady Mr Townsend and Family at their Lodgings in Hopkinton Col Jones House. din'd there. an agreeable Day. Returned to M Prentiss in the Evg.

18. *Tuesday.* Went in my Horse and chaise with M^{rs} Cooper accompanied with Capt Freeman and Wife to Medfield. Din'd at M^r Prentiss' Jun^r. Visited M^{rs} Adams p. m. Mrs Plimpton. M^m Chauncy, M^{rs} Hyslop. Mr Townsend. Slept and Horse at M^r Prentiss' Jun^r.

¹ The Rev. Stephen Badger (H. C. 1747), missionary to the Indians at Natick.

² The Rev. Samuel Locke, D.D. (H. C. 1755), minister of Sherborn, and sometime president of Harvard College.

19. *Wednesday.* Return'd to Capt Freeman's Lodgings at Holliston a. m. din'd with them and Slept.

20. Fast by Proclamation of Continental Congress thro all the Colonies. Mr Prentiss pch'd all day. I pray'd a. m.

21. *Friday.* Sat out early for Weston. call'd at D^r Locke's Sherburne at Capt Newell's, at M^r Badger's Natick. bated Horse there. call'd at Col Jones and saw Miss Sally Hatch. at M^r Fishers Needham : M^r Barrel and Lady and Deacon Storer's Lodgings. They absent. Din'd there. Most kindly receiv'd by M^r Fisher and Family. He accompanied us p. m. to Weston. Drank Coffee at Mr. Woodward's. slept at S. Horse at Hagars. found Brother Thomas¹ at Mr Savages, who had been there f'm Thursday Evg. the 13th. a Week.

22. *Saturday.* M^{rs} Cooper went with Mr Rea in my Chaise and Horse to Cambridg. She din'd at Col Johonnot's Lodgings. and return'd in Evg. I din'd at S. we slept there. Horse in his Stable. B^r Thomas went to live at Widow Hagar's.

23. *Lord's day.* M^{rs} Cooper and I din'd at M^r Lawrence's.² I pch'd for him all day. he pray'd p. m.

24. *Monday.* I went with M^r Rea to Cambridg. met Capt Freeman by Appointment at Watertown. Went with him to General Washington's. saw him, General Gates, M^r Reed. Din'd with Cap't Freeman at Col Johonnot's Quarters. procur'd a Place in the Army and Cloathing &c for B^r Thomas. Return'd in the Evg. we slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

25. *Tuesday.* At home all day. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's. Tommy went to the Army.

26. *Wednesday.* At home. Miss Usher and my Wife went p. m. to M^{rs} Baldwin's and drank Coffee. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

27. *Thursday.* Merciful Rain. at home all day. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

28. *Friday.* Went with M^{rs} Cooper in our Horse and chaise to Concord. call'd at M^r Hubbard's. din'd at M^r Beton's. drank Coffee on our Return at Capt Brown's slept at S. Horse at Hagars.

29. Sat out with my Horse and chaise after Dinner for little Cambridg. We Slept, and Horse there.

30. *Lord's day.* Went after Breakfast to Watertown. I preach'd there both Parts of the day. We drank Coffee and Din'd at D. Fisk's. I pray'd at Funeral of—return'd to M^r Dennies by Sunset. Slept, and Horse there. Wak'd by 1 °Clock in the Morn^g with Cannonading all round the Lines and in the Harbour of Boston. saw George Tavern in Flames. Cannon and small Arms continu'd till 5 °Clock, with but few slain on either Side.³

¹ Thomas Cooper, a younger brother of the diarist.

² At Lincoln.

³ Cf. Diary of Ezekiel Price, in *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 1863-64, p. 201; Paul Lunt's Book, *ibid.*, 1871-73, p. 196; Diary of Benjamin Boardman, *ibid.*, 1891-92, p. 400; Frothingham, *Siege of Boston*, p. 230.

31. *Monday.* We went after Breakfast to Watertown. I attended Corporation and Overseer's Meeting there. din'd with Corporation¹ at Davis Tavern. M^{rs} Cooper at Deacon Fisk's. I went p.m. to visit Dr Appleton and pray'd with him, very low. we return'd to M^r Dennies. slept and Horse there.

Aug. 1. Tuesday. Went after Breakfast in my chaise and Horse with My Wife towards Salem. call'd at Col Johonnot's Quarters. saw young Allen's Funeral. din'd at Deacon Cheaver's Lynn End: call'd at Mr Prescott's Danvers. drank Coffee. Slept and Horse at M^r W^m Davis.'

2. Went in the Morn^g with my Wife M^r and M^{rs} Davis to Salem. din'd at Deacon Smith's, saw Several Military Companies exercise on the Common, in Company with Mess^{rs} Bernard's &c. Slept and Horse at Deacon Smith's.

Aug. 3. Din'd at D. Smith's. purchas'd Here for myself and for Nabby, Handkerchiefs &c. Went after dinner With D. Smith and Lady to M^r Davis. drank Coffee. slept and Horse there. M^{rs} Davis presented Nabby with a Pair of Shoes. 35/ O. Ten'.

4. *Friday.* We left M^r Davis' after Breakfast. We din'd at General Lees Quarters at Medford in Company with M^{rs} Barnes of Marlboro, M^r Palfry &c. went after dinner to M^r Dennies Cambridg. slept and Horse there.

5. *Sat:* Return'd after Breakfast to Mr Savages. din'd and Slept there. Horse at Hagar's.

6. *Lord's day.* Went with M^{rs} Cooper to Watertown. pch'd all day. we din'd at Madam Storer's, drank Coffee at D. Fisk's. slept and Horse there.

7. *Monday.* M^{rs} Cooper din'd at Mr Merritts. I at M^r Hunts. return'd to M Savages. slept and Horse there. Nabby return'd f'm Princetown.

8. *Tuesday.* We Went after Breakfast to Watertown. I attended Corporation and Overseer's Meeting. din'd with them at Davis' Tavern M^{rs} C. at Brother Cooper Lodgings in Watertown. return'd to Mr Savages. slept and Horse there.

9. *Wednesday.* We din'd at Savage's. drank Coffee in Nabby's Chamber at M^r Russell's. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

10. *Thursday.* M^s Cooper went, (my chaise and Horse) with Nabby to Cambridg: They din'd at Col Johonnot's: I din'd at S. They return'd in the Evg. we slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

11. *Friday.* We din'd at Savages. went after dinner (my Horse and chaise) to Widow Bigelow's. drank Coffee there. call'd upon M^{rs} Baldwin. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

12. *Sat.* Went with M^{rs} Cooper after Breakfast (my Horse and Chaise) to Watertown. I din'd at M^r Hunt's with Committee of Supplies. M^{rs} Cooper proceeded to Medford, and din'd at M^r Turell's

¹ The fellows of the Corporation were Nathaniel Appleton, John Winthrop Andrew Eliot, Samuel Cooper, and John Wadsworth.

She return'd to Watertown 6 o Clock. We proceeded to M^r Dennies little Cambridg. Slept and Horse there.

13. *Lord's day.* I preach'd both Parts of the Day at little Cambridg : M^r Bigelow for me at Watertown. We Dined at M^r Dennies in Company with L^e Corn f'm Statia, Mr W^m Barrell f'm Philadelphia. We supp'd there with the same Company : Slept and Horse there.

14. I Went (Mr Dennies Horse and Chaise) with him to the Lines at Roxbury. saw the Fort &c. call'd upon General Thomas. return'd and din'd with M^{rs} Cooper at his House slept and Horse there.

15. *Tuesday.* Went with M^{rs} Cooper, my Horse and Chaise, thro Brooklyne to upper Roxbury : call'd at M^r Walters : I din'd at Noah Davis' : M^{rs} Cooper proceeded to Isaac William's : saw t e Trunks of Apparell, &c. She din'd there : return'd to Brooklyne. slept at M^{rs} Hyslop's. kindly entertain'd by her Son David. Horse there.

16. *Wednesday.* Went with M^{rs} C. my Horse and chaise to Medford. din'd with M^r Turell. met Mrs Newell, Payne &c to whom we design'd a Visit. drank Coffee at Col Johonnot's Quarters Cambridg. went to Mr Dennies. slept and Horse there.

17. Went with M^{rs} C. my H : and Ch. to Watertown. saw Col^l Hancock, Mr. Adams, Pair, Cushing, &c. Din'd at M^{rs} Hall's with Col Warren¹ and Lady, M^r Arnold Wells and Lady : Mess^{rs} Adams, &c. return'd to Savages. slept there. Horse at Hagar's.

18. Went with M^{rs} C. (my H. and Ch.) to Darch's Newton to visit Betsy Bulfinch dangerously sick. pray'd there. return'd to M^r age's. din'd there with M^r Woodward and Lady. slept there. Horse at Hagar's. Mercy Scollay and General Warren's little Daughters lodg'd with us.

19. *Saturday.* At home all day. wrote Letters to M^{rs} Handcock, and Mr. Eliot² at Fairfield. Deacon Jeffries visited us p. m. Nabby went in M^{rs} Scollay's Horse and chaise to M^{rs} Cockran's Watertown.

20. Went with M^{rs} C. (my H : and ch.) to Watertown. pch'd all day. We din'd at Deacon Fisk's. went about Sunset to Mr. Dennie's. slept and Horse there.

21. *Monday.* Went (in my H. and Ch.) to Watertown. I din'd at Madam Storer's M^{rs} C. went with Nabby to the Lines at Charlestown. I attended p. m. Committee of Overseers. obtain'd Leave to lodg occasionally in M^r Remington's Chambers. met M^r Tho^s Dennie who desir'd me to write to Gen^l Washington &c we return'd with him to his Father's. slept and Horse there.

22. *Tuesday.* M^{rs} C went in the Morn^g (my H. and Ch) to Watertown I accompanied Mr. Tho^s Dennie to Cambridg to Head Quarters Major Mifflin's &c. He then carried me to Watertown. Attended

¹ James Warren, of Plymouth, a graduate of Harvard College in 1745. He was a delegate to the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, and on the death of General Warren was chosen speaker. He married Mercy Otis, the talented sister of the patriot.

² The Rev. Andrew Eliot, minister of Fairfield, Conn., was a graduate of Harvard in 1762, and sometime librariän, tutor, and fellow of the college.

Overseer's Meeting. din'd with them at Coolidge's. slept at Mr. Remington's Chamber. Horse at Fisk's.

23. *Wednesday.* We breakfasted at Miss Cook's with M^r Warren Adams, &c I din'd at Deacon Fisk's. M^{rs} C. at her chamber. drank Coffee at M^{rs} Cockran's. return'd to Savage's. slept there. Horse at Hagar's.

24. Din'd at Savages. M^{rs} C. drank Coffee there p. m. I visited Mr. Inches; went on my Horse in Saddle. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

25. At Savages till p. m. went with M^{rs} C. (my H and Ch) to Baldwin's. drank Coffee there. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

26. *Saturday.* M^{rs} C. din'd at S. I at M^r Inches. slept at S. Horse at H. This night Detachm^t took Possession of plough'd Hill.¹

27. *Lord's day.* Went with M^{rs} C. (my H. and Ch) to Watertown. we din'd at D. Fisk's. I pch'd all day. D^r Appleton abroad p. m. saw 120 Riflers f'm Maryland on their March to the Camp. went to M^r Dennie's. slept and Horse there.

28. *Monday.* At M^r Dennies din'd. went to Cambridg Forenoon Nabby came to us in the Evening. slept and Horse there.

29. Great Storm. at M^r Dennies. M^r Barrell and Lè Corn din'd with us. slept and Horse there.

30. Rainy day still at M^r Dennies. din'd and spent the Evg with same Company slept and Horse there.

31. Rainy. still at Mr. Dennies: din'd and supp'd with same Company. slept and Horse there.

1. *Sept. Fryday.* Went with my Horse and Chaise to Cambridg din'd at Mr. Dennie's with Mr Lè Corn. went p. m. to Mr. Savages. slept there. Horse at Hagar's.

2. *Saturday.* At Savages all day. slept there. H at H.

3. Went (my H. and Ch) with M^{rs} C. to Watertown. pchd all day. slept at D. Fisk's Horse there.

4. *Monday.* Went (my H. and Ch) with M^{rs} C. to Cambridg. Corporation Meeting. She din'd at Mr. Turell's I at Steward Hastings. Came to Mr. Dennies. slept and Horse there.

5. *Tuesday.* At M^r Dennies unwell. slept and Horse there. unable to attend Overseer's and Corporation Meet^s at Watertown. M^{rs} C. and M^{rs} Dennie went to Watertown my Horse and chaise. M^r Rand visited us.

6. Still unwell at M^r Dennies. Went in my Horse and chaise to Thompson's Shop Brooklyne. p. m. rode 6 Miles. slept and Horse at Dennies.

7. *Thursday.* Went with M^{rs} C (my Horse and chaise) to Cambridg: rode round the Lines at Cambridg: beyond M^r Inman's. visited M^r Johnnot's Quarters saw D^r Bond. rode 10 Miles. Return'd and din'd at M^r Dennies. Spent afternoon at M^r Faneuils. return'd and slept at Mr D. Horse there.

¹ Ploughed Hill, known later as Mount Benedict, stood in the north-westerly part of Charlestown,—afterwards incorporated as the town of Somerville. See Washington's *Writings*, ed. Sparks, III. 71; Frothingham, *Siege of Boston*, pp. 233, 234.

8. *Friday*. I went with Mr Tho^s Dennie to Cambridg. din'd with him at Col. Glover's Quarters. M^r Johonnot absent. return'd by Watertown. M^{rs} Cooper went with Nabby to M^{rs} Williams at Roxbury : din'd there saw our Trunks. they drank Tea at Mr Pierpoints. Spent the Evg. and slept at M^r Dennies. Horse there. M^r James Dennie and Flag f'm N. Port and Major——f'm N. Hampshire.

Sept. 9. M^{rs} C. went (my Horse and Ch) to Weston. din'd at M^r Savage's. I din'd at M^r Dennie's with B^r Cooper. Tommy Bryant very ill. I gave him a Puke. Mrs C. return'd in Evg. we slept and Horse at Dennies.

10. *Lord's day*. Exchang'd M^r Coggins. He pch'd all day for me at Watertown. I for him at little Cambridg. pray'd at Warren's child's Funeral. slept and Horse at M^r D.

11. Went with M^{rs} Cooper (my Horse and chaise) to Framingham. din'd at M^r Woodward's: drank Coffee with Capt Freeman at Framingham. Married Henry Prentiss and Ruth Freeman. Fee i Guinea. slept and Horse there.

12. *Tuesday*. Visited M^{rs} Bridg and M^{rs} Savage a. m. 3 Miles my Horse &c. Din'd with our Friends at their Lodgings. M^r Buckminster's. slept and Horse there. visited p. m. with our Friends Mr Stone at Sthboro 10 Miles.

13. Went with our Friends to Hopkintown; din'd at Co^l Jones' Invitation at his Home, with Mr Townsend &c. returned to Cap^t Freeman's Lodgings. slept and Horse there. 10 Miles.

14. *Thursday*. rode upon my Horse in a Saddle g. Miles. a. m. Din'd with our Friends at M^r Buckminster's. slept and Horse there.

15. Took Leave of our good Friends. Return'd and din'd at M^r Savages. Neighbor Right buried. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

16. *Saturday*. Din'd at S. went, (my Horse and Ch) after Dinner to M^r Dennies. found Nabby unwell. slept and Horse.

17. *Lord's day*. Breakfasted at Mr. Dennies. went to Watertown, pch'd all day and administer'd L. S. din'd at Deacon Fisk's. return'd after Service p. m. to M^r Dennie's. slept and Horse there. saw Couzin Sally Chardon as I pass'd Mr Zegur's¹ House.

18. Went after Breakfast to Watertown saw D^r Winthrop sick. Met D^{rs} Appleton and Chauncy there. Din'd with M^{rs} C. at D. Fisk's. visited p. m. Mr. Prentice's Family and pray'd there remarkably visited with Sickness and repeated Deaths. return'd to M^r Savage's. M^{rs} Whitney presented us on our Return with two fine Chickens. Capt Freeman and Wife slept with us at S. Horse at Hagers.

19. *Tuesday*. Went with Capt Freeman and Wife to Concord. visited with them M^r Hubbard, and Emerson: The latter and Wife out of Town: our Friends engag'd M^{rs} Hubbard to take th'r Son at Board proceeded with them to Sudbury thinking to go to Worcester. We din'd at Rice's Tavern. Soon after getting into our chaises it rain'd hard. Capt Freeman and Wife return'd to Framingham. We to

¹Segar, also spelled Seger.

Weston. call'd at M^{rs} Coats' Sudbury. rode 22 Miles in all. slept at Mr. S. Horse at Hagars.

20. *Wednesday.* At M^r Savages all day slept there. Horse at Hagars.

21. *Thursday.* At M^r Savages all day. slept there. H: at Hagars.

22. *Friday.* M^{rs} C. went after Breakfast (my Horse and Ch.) to Cambridg. spent the Day there, and return'd in the Evening. I went with M^{rs} Melvill (her Chaise and Horse) to Concord. We din'd at good M^r Beton's after Dinner She slipt into my Hand, in a most obliging Manner a Bill of 20/ Lawf. Money. return'd p. m. to M^r Savages, the Weather rainy. M^{rs} C. arriv'd soon after. slept there. H. at Hagars.

23. *Saturday.* Paid M^{rs} Savage 27 Pounds ten Shillings O. Ten^r in full for our Board, (deducting Absence) f'm 10 June to this day, inclusively. din'd at M^r Savages: went with M^{rs} Cooper, (my Horse and Chaise) to little Cambridg. slept at M^r Dennies. Horse there.

24. *Lord's day.* Went to Watertown (my H. and ch) pch'd there all day. return'd to Mr. Dennie's. slept and H. there.

25. *Monday.* Went after Breakfast with M^r C. (my H: and Ch) to Milton. din'd at B^r Gardiner's,¹ visited Mad^m Foye found her in her own House, call'd at M^r John Adam's. drank Coffee slept at Col. Quincy's. Horse there.

26. *Tuesday.* Went f'm Col Quincy's 9 ^o/Clock for Kingston. bated my Horse at Widow Gardiners on Hingham Plains. din'd at M^r Baldwin's; Hannover. arriv'd at Mr Rand's, Sunset. slept and Horse there. found the Family, and dear Sister Rand's² children well.

27. *Wednesd.* M^r Rand accompanied us to Plimpton, 6. Miles. visited M^r Parker the Pastor and his Colleague M^r Sampson. the former a Cancer in his Leg. Left Mr Rand there, proceeded with M^{rs} C. to Middleboro. arrived at M^r Bowdoin's in Judg Olivers³ House about 12—13 Miles f'm M^r Rand's. most Kindly receiv'd. M^r Bowdoin better. din'd there. rode out with him in his Chaise p. m. 6 Miles. slept and Horse there.

28. *Thursday.* Took Leave of M^r Bowdoin and Family. He put into my Hands at parting a Bill of Sixe Pounds Lawf. Money, and a Chicken and Bottle of Wine into our Chaise. we call'd at M^r Perkins, Bridgwater, at Mr Porters. din'd at Curtiss' Tavern. met at Braintree, M^r Tafts Parish our Friend M^{rs} Clark. drank Coffee, slept and supp'd with her. Horse at Mr Tafts: who with his Wife and D^r Porter spent the Evg with us at Capt Pennyman's, M^{rs} Clark's Lodgings.

29. *Friday.* Came thro the blue Hills to Milton. went to Brush Hill, Timothy Tucker's House: din'd with M^r Sherburne and Family. gave us a Bottle of Kyan. came by the Paper Mills to Dorchester, by

¹ Dr. Samuel Gardner.

² Judith Cooper, who married first, Dr. John Sever (H. C. 1749), and secondly, William Rand, of Kingston, Mass. She died February 16, 1764, and left issue.

³ Peter Oliver, D.C.L. (H.C. 1730), Chief Justice of the Province.

Roxbury Meeting-House — Supp'd at M^r Pierpoint's with General Ward, M^r Conant, Willard of Mendam: Frost a Candidate &c M^r West¹ of Dartmouth. slept and Horse there.

30. At Breakfast a smart Cannonading f'm the Enemy on Lamb's Dam.² call'd at M^r Dennies, at Major Thompson's, at Watertown. din'd at Mr Savages. slept there. Horse at Hagar's.

1 *Octr. Lord's day.* Went with M^{rs} Cooper my (Horse and chaise) to Deacon Fisk's. din'd there. pch'd all day Watertown. went after Service to Mr Dennie's Saw M^r Martin of R. Island. slept and Horse there.

2. *Monday.* Went to Corporation at Watertown, din'd there. (my Horse and Ch) M^{rs} Cooper din'd at M^r Dennies. I return'd. slept and Horse there.

3. *Tuesday.* Went (my H: and ch) to Watertown Overseer's Meeting. din'd there. M^{rs} C. at M^r Dennies. she with M^{rs} Dennie visited Miss Boucher. I return'd Evg. slept and Horse at M^r Dennies.

4. Went with M^{rs} C. (my H. and Ch) in Company with M^{rs} Dennie and Boucher to Medford. din'd M^r Payne's Family. saw Ellis Gray and Lady. slept at Mr Turell's. Horse there.

5. *Thursday.* Detain'd by Rain at M^r T. I visited p. m. General Sullivan, at M^r Bishop's, M^r Osgood. slept and Horse at Mr T.

6. *Friday.* Came with M^{rs} C. to Cambridg: thro Camp at Winter and Prospect Hills. saw General Washington Lee &c at the Top of the Hill: the former obligingly invited us to dine at head Quarters, visited M^{rs} Miffling. I din'd with General W. M^{rs} C. at Col. Johonnot's. return'd to M^r Savage's in Evg. slept there, and H. at Hagar's.

7. At Savages all day. slept there. H. at Hagar's.

8. *Lord's day.* Went (my H. and Ch) to Watertown: rainy Forenoon. pch'd there all day. visited M^r Baker sick. spent the Evg and slept at M^r Dennies. Horse there.

9. Sat out f'm thence for Worcester (my H. and Ch) din'd at Baldwin's. paid for Oats. Dinner gratis. we drank Coffee slept and Horse at Cap't Freeman's Lodgings, Framingham.

10. *Tuesday.* Went with our dear Friends Capt F. and Lady towards W. din'd at Cushing's. Shrewsbury. I visited M^r Sumner. reach'd M^r Williams's Worcester at 4 o'Clock. saw that Family M^{rs} Royall &c well. slept and Horse there.

11. Went M^r Williams H: and Ch. with M^{rs} C. to Liecester: stopt at M^r Conchlyn's Door. went to Col Henshaws. all abroad but Col Jos. Henshaw. din'd with him. return'd. visited Cheeseman, More &c of Boston. visited M^r Manarty:³ who spent preceding Evg with us at M^r W: with M^r Lyman of Hatfield and M^r Hub-

¹ Presumably the Rev. Samuel West, D.D. (H.C. 1754), minister of Dartmouth, and chaplain in the Revolutionary army. It was he who deciphered the letter of Dr. Benjamin Church.

² The position of a battery in Roxbury.

³ Perhaps Moriarty.

bard of . . . slept and H. at M^r William's. Much Thunder and severe Lightning f'm Sunset to 10 ° Clock.

12. *Thursday.* Left our Friends. call'd at Landman's. We din'd Mr Stone's Capt Freeman and Lady Mr Bomen's [P] Lodgings. I heard him preach M^r Stones Lecture. return'd to Capt Freemans Lodgings. slept and H. there.

13. *Friday.* Din'd at the same place. Took Leave of our good Friends after Dinner. call'd at M^r Woodward's. drank Coffee. slept, and Horse at M^r Savages.

14. *Sat.* din'd at M^r Savage's. Went after Dinner to Mr Dennies. Slept and Horse there.

15. *Lord's day.* Pch'd all day at Watertown. baptiz'd 2. Drank Coffee at M^r Halls with Mrs. Warren, [illegible] Allyne Otis' and Lady &c. saw D^r Franklyn and Mr. Linch.² slept and Horse at Mr Cushings Waltham.

16. *Mond.* Went with M^{rs} C. (my H and Ch) to Cambridg. D^r Franklin &c absent at the Lines. I din'd with Stuart Hastings. M^{rs} C. saw in the afternoon flat Bottom Boats in Cambridg River. the Troops embarked in th'm &c. Slept at Mr Dennies. Horse there.

17. Went f'm M^r Dennies (my H. and ch) to General Washington's. I din'd there. With D^r Franklin, the Committee of Continental Congress,³ M^r Bowdoin &c. M^{rs} C. at M^r Dennies. she brot my H. and Ch. and carried me back there. slept and H. there.

18. *Wednesday.* Went my H. and Ch. to Watertown. saw D^r Prescott who paid me 60 £ O. Ten' for six Sabbaths at Groton. We din'd at Deacon Fisk's. Came to Mr Savage's. Slept and Horse there.

19. *Thursday.* rainy. Came with M^{rs} C. (my H. and Ch.) to Watertown. din'd by Invitation of the House of Representatives at Coolidge's Tavern with General Washington, the general Officers of the Army, Committee of Continental Congress. D^r Franklin, Col Harrison of Virginia, M^r Lynch of Carolina, Gov^r Cook⁴ of R. Island. Lt. Governor Grizzald⁵ of Connecticut, and a great Number of Gentlemen of this and other Colonies: the Council of Massachusetts &c. M^{rs} C. din'd. We return'd to B^r Cushings at Waltham. slept and Horse there.

20 *Eryday.* M^{rs} Cooper went (my H. and Ch) to Mr Dennies. She din'd there. I accompanied her as far as Watertown. din'd with Speaker Warren and Lady at their Lodgings. M^r Cooper carried Nabby f'm M^r Dennies to our new Lodgings M^r Clark's⁶ Waltham. came back and return'd with me there. We slept and H there for first Time.

¹ Samuel Allyne Otis (H. C. 1759), brother of James Otis, and a delegate to the Continental Congress.

² Thomas Lynch, of South Carolina, delegate to the Continental Congress. His son, Thomas Lynch, Jr., was a signer of the Declaration of Independence.

³ Washington's *Writings*, ed. Sparks, III. 123, and note.

⁴ Nicholas Cooke.

⁵ Matthew Griswold, LL.D., chief justice of the Superior Court, and afterwards governor of Connecticut.

⁶ Perhaps Deacon John Clarke, one of the selectmen of Waltham.

21. M^{rs} C. Nabby and myself din'd at M^r Clark's. slept and Horse there.

22. *Lord's day.* Went with M^{rs} C. to Watertown. pch'd all day there. din'd at D. Fisk's. return'd to M^{rs} Clark's. We and Nabby slept, and Horse there.

23. M^{rs} C. went (my H. and ch) to M^r Savages din'd there with M^r Bowdoin, John Pitts &c. I din'd at Watertown M^m Storer's. Nabby at Russell's, carried there by her Mother. M^{rs} C. return'd alone f'm Westown. I f'm Watertown. M^r Bowdoin and J. Pitts drank Coffee with us at M^r Clark's. M^{rs} C. and I slept and Horse there.

24. *Tuesday.* Went with M^{rs} C. to Watertown, Corporation and Overseer's Meeting; which fail'd by Presidents not coming. I din'd at Fowl's with M^r Bowdoin &c it being rainy, M^{rs} C. went (my H. and ch) to Newtown after Hay. She din'd with Nabby Bulfinch at Durell's. We slept and Horse at M^r Clark's.

25. Nabby and Katy came f'm Westown to M^r Clark's a. m. We all din'd there. M^{rs} C. went (my H: ch) to M^{rs} Cushings. We then sat out for Mr Dennies. M^{rs} C. went to Newtown. return'd to M^r D. we slept and Horse there.

26. *Thursday.* I Went (my Horse and ch) to General Washington's to attend D^r Franklin, M^r Bowdoin, D^r Winthrop and Lady, to Middleboro', M^r Bowdoin's House. sat out about 2 °Clock. At M^r Pierpoint's Roxbury receiv'd M^{rs} Cooper bro't there by M^{rs} Dennie. We din'd at Col. Quincy's Braintree. slept and Horse there. D^r F. M^r B. slept there also. D^r W. and Lady at M^{rs} Adam's.

27. sat out f'm Col. Quincy's 9 °Clock in Company with the above nam'd. Din'd at Col Howard's Bridgwater, M^r Bowdoin's Expence. reach'd his House Sunset. Spent the Evg most agreeably there. Slept and H. there.

28. *Saturday.* Din'd at M^r Bowdoin's; M^r Conant added to the Company. Slept and H: there.

29. *Lord's day.* D^r Franklin left us 9 °Clock to proceed on his Journey. M^r Conant pch'd a.m. and administer'd L. S. we spent Interval at his House, drank Coffee there. I pch'd p.m. return'd with D^r W. and Lady, M^r Bowdoin &c to his House, slept and H: there.

30. *Monday.* We, with D^r Winthrop and Lady, left our dear Friends M^r B. and Family, 9 °Clock. having been entertain'd there in the most engaging Manner. We din'd at Turner's Tavern Braintree. Getting out of my Chaise, turned my Ankle and strain'd it greatly. Spent afternoon and slept at Mr. Clark's Lodgings. Capt Pennyman's. Kindly nurs'd there with my Lameness. Horse at B^r Taft's. D^r W. and Lady proceeded on their Journey. D^r Wales kindly dress'd my Ankle gratis.

31. *Tuesday.* Came to Madam Foyes. din'd slept and Horse there. kindly nurs'd there. Nancy Jeffries drank Coffee with Nabby at M^r Clark's.

Novr. 1. Wednesday. We came to General Ward's Quarters at M^r Pierpoints. I din'd there. M^{rs} C. dind. saw Capt M^{pherson}.¹ came to M^r Clark's. found Nabby well. slept and Horse there.

¹ Doubtless Duncan McPherson, who two months later fell at Quebec.

Novr. 2. Thursday. Mrs C. and I went my H : and ch to Westown. din'd at M^r Savages. Nabby at M^{rs} Cockran's. return'd to M^r Clark's slept and H. there.

Novr. 3. Friday. Rainy. Our little Family all at home. B^r Williams of Sandwich, and M^r Curtiss my former Parishioners drank Coffee with us. slept and Horse at home

Novr. 4. Went M^r Clark's Horse to Watertown. din'd with my little Family at home i. e. Mr Clark's. M^r James Dennie and B^r Cooper drank Coffee with us. slept and Horse there on M^r Clark's Hay still. In the Evg. my Hay f'm Watertown. 6^l and 1/2.

Novr. 5. Lord's day. Went to Watertown with M^{rs} Cooper pch'd all day there, we din'd at Deacon Fisk's. Nabby at home all day. We return'd, in Evg. slept there. Horse on my own Hay.

N. 6. Monday. Our Family at home all day. I visited Mr Payne and Family p. m. D^r Langdon and Mr Wadsworth spent Evg. with me. did not sup. slept and H. at home.

Novr. 7. Tuesday. Went with Mr Calendar my H : and ch. to Watertown. Corporation and overseers Meeting. adjourn'd to——— rainy day. I din'd with Corporation at Coolidge's. M^{rs} Cooper and my Family at home. slept and H. there.

Novr. 8. Wednesday. Went to M^r Payne's a. m. alone. Welman put one Shoe on my Horse, paid. saw Mr Payne. din'd at home with all my Family. M^{rs} Cooper and I visited p. m. Mrs Turell. We all slept, and H : at home. M^{rs} Blanchard slept with us.

Novr. 9. Thursday. Went with M^{rs} Cooper, my H : and ch : to Mr Dennies after dining at home with Mrs Blanchard. slept and H : there. M^{rs} Blanchard slept with Nabby at M^r Clark's

Novr. 10. Friday. M^{rs} Cooper and I all day at Mr Dennies slept and H : there. Nabby and M^{rs} Blanchard at Mr Clark's

Novr. 11. Saturday. Went with M^{rs} Cooper f'm M^r Dennies to old Cambridg. din'd with Nabby and M^{rs} Blanchard at M^r Clark's We all slept and H. there

Novr. 12. Went with M^{rs} Cooper my H : and ch. to Watertown Nabby and M^{rs} Blanchard went also. She din'd at Madam Hunts. M^{rs} Cooper Nabby and I at Mr Fisk's. pch'd all day at Watertown. We all slept and H. at M^r Clark's.

Novr. 13. M^{rs} Blanchard left us this Morn^e. Our Family din'd at home. Went with M^{rs} Cooper, my H : and ch : p. m. to Menomoty.¹ slept and Horse at Mr Cook's.

Novr. 14. Tuesday. Sat out after Breakfast f'm Mr Cook's. call'd at Cooper's Tavern.² receiv'd of M^r Phillips White 10^l Lawf. Money

¹ Menotomy.

² This tavern, which stood where the Arlington House now stands, was kept by Benjamin Cooper. During the retreat from the fight at Lexington, April 19, 1775, it was entered by British soldiers, "and two aged gentlemen were most barbarously and inhumanly murdered by them." See deposition of Benjamin and Rachel Cooper, in *Journ. Prov. Cong. Mass.*, p. 678.

being Legacy left me by W^m White Esq^r proceeded to Medford, call'd at M^r Turell's. din'd at M^r Treadwell's Lynn. reach'd Salem slept and H. at Deacon Smiths. saw D^r Pemberton this Evg.

Novr. 15. Wednesday. Intended to have gone to Dummer School to see little Sammy. prevented by a great Storm. Din'd, slept, and H. at D. Smith's. M^r Bernard Jun^r and M^r Jackson of Newbury Port supp'd with us.

Novr. 16. Thursday. Cold and windy. Left Salem to return home. Roads bad by g't Rains. Chaise Broke 2. Miles f'm Salem. assisted in mending it by Prurington and Varny Quakers din'd at Couzin Jacob Cooper's Quarters at Medford. slept and Horse at M^r Turell's.

17. Friday. Call'd at M^r Boylstons. bought a warming Pan. 3 Doll. a Stove and Frame 50 /. old Tenr. call'd at Mr Brook's Medford. at Col Johonnots Quarters. I din'd with M^r Leonard¹ at Connecticut Head Q^{rs}. M^{rs} C. return'd home p. m. found Polly Johnston with Nab by who had din'd with her and assisted altering her Gown.

Novr. 18. Saturday. Din'd at home. Polly Johnston again came after Breakfast, and din'd with us. I went my H: and ch. to Watertown p. m. return'd. slept. and H. at home.

Novr. 19. Went with M^{rs} Cooper my H: and ch. to Watertown. I pch'd there all day. we din'd at Deacon Fisk's. Nabby din'd at home. attended p. m. Waltham.

Novr. 20. Went with M^{rs} C. (my H. and Ch) to Weston. din'd with M^r Savage. return'd slept and H. at home.

21. Tuesday. Walk'd to Watertown a. m. We all din'd at home. slept and H. at home

22. Wednesday. rode (my H. and ch) to Watertown. We all din'd at home. B^r Cooper and Judy call upon us p. m. M^r James Denny invited us in Name of Family to dine at his Fathers to morrow, being Th-g. invited also by M^{rs} Hunt Jun^r and old M^r Hunt: and M^r Halls. We all slept and H. at home. Salem Smith bro't M^{rs} Melvill's Bed. paid him. Paid Billings Tailor.

23. Thursday. Pub. Thanksg. Went, my H: and ch. to Watertown. pch'd there. Went after Service with M^{rs} C. to M^r Dennies. James Denny carried Nabby. We din'd with Capt Davis there, Miss Katy Wendell, D^r Fog of Fairfield &c. We came home, left Nabby there. slept and H: at home.

24. Friday. Walk'd a. m. to Watertown and return'd. Call'd at M^r Bemus' by the Way and thank'd him for the Frame of a Stove, He presented me. M^{rs} C. and I din'd at home. Slept and H. at home. Nabby still at M^r Dennies M^r Payne and M^r Cushing drank Coffee with us. Deacon Storer and M^r Barrell call'd upon us, inform'd us of M^r Frank Green's Wife's Death.

25. Saturday. Rode (my H and ch) to Watertown. paid Davis Tavernkeeper his Note, 1. Doll. and Marshall in full for Candles.

¹The Rev. Abiel Leonard, D.D. (H. C. 1759) chaplain of the Connecticut forces.
VOL. VI.—22.

Din'd at home. B^r Cooper came f'm Brewer's Tavern after slight Dinner and ate Fish with us: Sister Cooper came over after Dinner, and gave us a short Visit. walk'd to M^r Payne's Lodgings. slept and H: at home. Nabby still at Mr Dennie's.

26. *Sunday.* went (my H: and ch.) to Watertown. pch'd there all day: din'd at Deacon Fisk's. slept and H: at home. Nabby still at M^r D.

27. *Monday.* Deacon Storer and M^r Joshua Green call'd upon us this Morn^e. They went to the Lines at Roxbury. carried a letter f'm M^{rs} C. to her Brother. Nabby came home this Forenoon. Slept and H. at home.

28. *Tuesday.* M^r Jonathan Williams call'd and din'd with us I went p. m. to Watertown (my H: and ch) pray'd with the Town of Boston previous to th'r Choice of Representative in Room of D^r Church.¹ John Brown chosen. Col Gerrish gave me a Letter f'm Master Moody² respecting Sammy. Slept and H: at home

29. *Wednesday.* Went in the Forenoon with Mrs C. (my H and ch to Cambridg. M^r Zephion Thayer paid me 26 L.M. Mrs C. din'd at Stuart Hastings. I call'd on M^r Leonard, Connecticut Head Quarters. went f'm thence by Invitation to General Lee's Quarters. din'd with him at Hobgobling Hall.³

Took Mrs C. at Cambridg. slept and H. at home.

30. *Thursday.* Went with M^{rs} C. (my H: and ch.) to the Lines at Roxbury. with D. Storer M^r Payne Barrell &c. Mrs C. din'd. I at General Thomas' M^r Chases' [?] Invitation with the above Gentlemen. found they had innoculated at Boston small Pox. went p. m. with Mrs. C to Madam Foye's Milton. slept and H. there. called at Sister Gardiner's. Nabby at Home.

1. *Decr. Friday.* Came f'm Milton in Forenoon. We din'd at Mr Robert Pierpoints. called at Mr Dennies. slept and H: at home.

2. *Sat.* I made a Visit to M^r Payne's a. m. We all din'd at home. went p. m. on Foot to Watertown. slept and H at home.

3. *Lord's day.* Exchang'd with Mr Cushing. I baptiz'd at Waltham Twins and another Infant. Nabby and I din'd at M^r Payne's; with D. Storer, Barrell and Lady &c. Mrs Cooper confin'd at home: slept and H. there.

4. Went with Nabby (my H and ch) to Watertown. she din'd at Mrs Cochran's: I at M^r Hunt's opposite Davis Tavern. I attended Corporation Meeting at Coolidge's. slept and H. home.

5. *Tuesday.* Attended (my H: and ch) Corporation and Overseer's Meeting at Watertown. din'd with former at Coolidges. Corporation sat at D^r Appleton's Lodgings Watertown. Overseer's adjourn'd to last Tuesday in Feby. next.

¹ See Washington's *Writings*, ed. Sparks, III. 115, 116, 502 *et seq.*

² Samuel Moody (H. C. 1746), Master of Dummer School.

³ General Lee's quarters in the Royall house at Medford, "whose echoing corridors suggested to his fancy the name of Hobgoblin Hall."

6. *Wednesday.* Went with M^{rs} C. (my H and ch) to Cambridg. Went to head Quarters Cambridg. [saw] General Gates. Call'd at Col Mifflins. saw D^r Morgan's Lady there. view'd the fine Mortar¹ (lately taken) on Cambridg Common. Din'd at Mr Hastings Stuart; M^{rs} C. after having gone to little Cambridg call'd for me, we came to Watertown. I attended and pray'd there at M^{rs} Sangar's Funeral. We went to M^r Payne's. Drank Coffee there with Deacon Smith and Lady. D. Storer M^r Barrell etc. return'd home about 3 ° Clock. slept and H. there Nabby drank Coffee at M^{rs} Durant's. This day received a Billet directed to me from Boston inclosing a Sheet of Paper half printed the other Manuscript, being an Acc't of the Play to be acted at the Opening the Boston Theatre.² General Washington and several General Officers of our Army receiv'd a similar one. This is the Form of an Invitation to attend. It came out by the Lines at Roxbury with a Flag of Truce.

7. *Thursday.* Went with M^{rs} C (my H : and ch) to Deacon Storer's and Mr Barrells Lodgings at M^r Harringtons 3 Miles. Din'd with them agreeably to their kind Invitation last Evg. saw M^r Black from Boston : who gave us an Acc't of the State of Things there, and that they had inoculated not f'm Necessity, for only one or two had Small Pox, but as a Battery agst our Army and the Country. slept and H : at home Call'd at M^{rs} Turell's as we return'd.

8. Went with Mrs C. and Nabby my H. and ch. to M^{rs} Turell's, 2 Miles Din'd there agreeably to her kind Invitation last Evg. Mrs. Newell, Payne, Cushing &c. drank Coffee with us there. slept and H : at home.

9. *Saturday.* Went alone (my H : and Ch.) to Watertown a. m. We all din'd at home, and M^r James Dennie with us. slept and H. at home. This Day receiv'd f'm Parish at Watertown 1000 or 1200^{wt} of Hay. Call'd upon Mrs. Newman p. m. at the Mellicot's.³

10. *Lords' day.* Went with M^{rs} C. and Nabby my H : and ch. to Watertown. we all din'd at Deacon Fisk's. I pch'd there all day. visited after Meeting p. m. M^r Fatherly f'm Boston sick. we all return'd home slept and H. there.

11. *Monday.* We all din'd at home. Went p. m. (my H : and ch.) with M^{rs} C. to Sister Cooper's at Deacon Livermore's. 2. Miles. drank Coffee there. slept and H at home.

12. *Tuesday.* rode alone (my H : and ch) to Watertown. Din'd at M^r Hall's Invitation at his House with Speaker Warren, Mr. Lover &c. returned home in Evg. visited by Mr Blanchard and Jonathan Pollard receiv'd a Letter f'm M^r Johonnot informing me little Sammy was bro't by him to his Lodgings at Medford. slept and H : at home.

13. *Wednesday.* Went (my H : and ch.) with M^{rs} C. and Nabby to Watertown. They proceeded to Medford and din'd with Mrs Johonnot at M^r Brook's. bro't Sammy home with them. Col Johonnot marching with Marblehead Regiment to relieve that Place said

¹ See Diary of Ezekiel Price, *l. c.*, p. 217, Frothingham, *l. c.*, p. 270.

² See *Mem. Hist. Boston*, III. 161; Timothy Newell's Journal, *l. c.*, p. 271.

³ Perhaps Milliquet.

to be attack'd by several Ships of War. I visited M^r Fatherly again. Din'd at M^r John Hunt's, at their Invitation with Col Orne, Palmer, M^r Gerry¹ etc. walk'd home. slept. Sammy with us, and H. at home.

14. *Thursday*. Went with M^{rs} C. (my H and ch) to Watertown. She proceeded to old and little Cambridg to buy Things for Sammy. I din'd at M^{rs} Cockran's on a Pig, with M^r Faneuil and Lady, and D^r Spring.² Nabby and Sammy din'd at home. I walk'd home in Evg. M^{rs} C. return'd in chaise. M Blanchard and Pollard call'd in the Evg. slept: and H. at home. M^r Cooke presented me a Bottle of Snuff.

15. *Friday*. M^{rs} C. went (my H: and ch) to Weston. din'd at Mr Savages. Nabby took an early Dinner and proceeded with Mr Blanchard in his chaise on a Visit to his Lady and Friends at Braintree. I din'd with Sammy at home. slept and H. at home.

16. M^{rs} C. carried little Sammy after Breakfast to Medford. M^{rs} Johonnots Lodgings. she din'd—return'd in Evg. I din'd at home: Went before dinner with M^{rs} Turell to Watertown and return'd with her. Slept and H, at home. Nabby at Braintree.

17. *Lord's day*. Went with M^{rs} C. my H: and ch. to Watertown. pch'd there all day. we both din'd at Deacon Fisk's. baptiz'd Joseph —of—Warren of little Cambridg. pray'd after Service p. m. at Funeral of M^r Spring's Child.

18. *Monday*. I walk'd out to Neighbor Hastings and Cuttings we din'd, slept and H at home. Nabby at Braintree.

19. *Tuesday*. Went with Mrs C. (my Horse and chaise) to Cambridg. we waited on General Washington, his Lady Mrs Gates &c. At Head Quarters. Treated with Oranges and a Glass of Wine. invited to dine with them, but excus'd ourselves. Went half past one for little Cambridg. Din'd at Mr Dennie's. return'd home in the Evening. slept and H. at home. Nabby still absent. This Day Capt Brown sent me two Hundred W^t. of Hay.

20. *Wednesday*. We din'd at home. I went (my H: and ch.) to Watertown. slept and H: at home Nabby still absent.

21. *Thursday*. very cold. We din'd at home. M^r Storer call'd upon us p. m. told us of a Vessell f'm England. bro't me a Letter f'm Js. Smith Jun^r. slept and H. at home. Froze Urine as well as Water in our Chambers. Nabby still absent.

22. *Friday*. Mrs C. went (my H: and ch) to M^r Fratingham to get the Chaise mended. did not dine at home. I did. she left the Chaise at his Shop: where she went twice. 8. Miles in all. slept and H. at home Nabby absent. very cold.

23. Still very cold. We din'd at home. I went, p. m. with M^r Clark to Watertown in his H: and ch. went to the Treasurer and Committee of Gen^l Court to hasten his Pay for Wood, that he might proceed on a journey to N. York, return'd home. slept and H. at home. Nabby still abroad.

¹ Elbridge Gerry, the statesman and signer.

² Dr. Marshall Spring (H. C. 1762), a man distinguished in his profession and a Tory. In later years he was a member of the Council of Massachusetts.

24. *Lord's day.* Great Storm of Snow. Went with M^{rs} C. (my Horse and ch) to Watertown. pch'd all Day. return'd. slept and H. at home.

25. *Monday.* Went with M^r Clark his Horse and chaise to Watertown and Cambridg. I dind at Col Johonnot's Quarters. M^{rs} Cooper at home. slept and H. at home. Nabby still absent.

Tuesday. 26. M^{rs} C. went my H: and Fratingham's Chaise to bring home my chaise. We din'd at home. I walk'd p. m. two Miles. cold. slept and H. at home.

Wednesday. 27. I walk'd to Watertown. din'd at M^r Bemus' M^{rs} Cooper at home. Katy went my Horse and chaise to Braintree for Abby. Miss Polly Johnston din'd with M^{rs} Cooper at home. I walk'd home. slept there. H. at Braintree.

Thursday. 28. I Walked to Watertown. din'd with M^r John Adams at M^r Hunt's Senior. M^{rs} Cooper at home. Katy return'd without Abby, Madame Apthorp kindly urging her to stay at Braintree. I walk'd home. slept and H: there.

Friday. 29. We din'd at home. I went (with my H: and ch.) with M^r Clarke to Watertown. Col. Warren at my Desire chang'd his Money of this Province for Continental Bills. I paid Fratingham for mending chaise 8/. Lawf. M. paid Patten in full. paid Gardiner for Shaft of chaise. 5/. Townsend for mending my Silver Watch and for Seal and Key 12/6. slept and H: at home.

Saturday. 30th We din'd at home. Sister Cooper spent Afternoon and drank Coffee with us. I went p. m. (my H: and ch) to Watertown. Slept and H at home. Nabby still absent.

Lord's day. Decr. 31. Rainy and raw Weather. Went with M^{rs} C. (my H: and ch) to Watertown. pch'd all day upon barren Fig Tree. adapted last Day in Year. Din'd at D. Fisk's. return'd in the Evg. Slept and H. at home.

Monday. 1. Jany. 1776. We din'd at home. Mr Storer, Barrell, call'd upon me with Capt Martin lately f'm London and Boston. M^r Foster of Marblehead call'd a. m. I went my H: and ch. p. m. to Watertown. my Horse shod and cork'd by M^r Lath. paid him in Full four Pistareens.¹ call'd upon M^r White and Family. Gave to M^r W^m Newman 72.15.9 Lawf. Money, to purchase Goods at N. York for which He gave a Memorandum. slept and H. at home.

Tuesday 2. M^r Clark and Newman sat out for N. York 10 ° Clock. Mr Leonard Chaplain to Connecticut Forces call'd upon me. Went with M^{rs} C. (my H: and ch.) to little Cambridg. Din'd M^r Dennies. return'd p. m. M^r Ned Green call'd upon us with Mr Balch lately from London. read King's Speech to Parliament. slept and H. at home.

Wednesday 3. Jany Paid M^r Kory in full viz. for Meal Potatoes and 1^{lb} Sawsages, 21/6. Paid his Sons John and Enoch in full to this day for taking Care of my Horse at 18 £ O. Ten' pr Year, for two Months

¹ Pistareen, at that time equal to about 19.3 of our cents.

and one Week 4. 17. 6. M^r Ned Green sent a written Invitation to us to Dine with Him to day in Company Mr Balch. Excus'd ourselves f'm dining. spent afternoon there, and till 8 °Clock Evg. with M^r Balch, Paynes Family, Storer Barrell &c slept and H at home.

Thursday, 4th. Went (my H : and ch.) to Watertown, after dining at home. slept and H. at home.

Friday, 5th Jan^y. We din'd at home. Visited according to our Invitation p. m. By M^r Payne and Lady, M^r Barrell and his, M^r Cushing and his, M^r Ned Green and his, M^r Storer and Balch, M^{rs} Newell, M^{rs} Turell, who drank Coffee and spent fore part of the Evg. with us. M^r Bowen call in and spent an Hour or two. At Candle light Nabby came home with M^r Jack Wheelwright, after having been absent with Braintree Friends just 3. Weeks. soon after M^r Blanchard and Lady arriv'd. M^{rs} Blanchard supp'd and slept with us. The Gentlemen went off before Supper.

Saturday 6th M^r Blanchard and Wheelwright breakfasted with us. They went off 10 °Clock. After a week of very mild Weather very cold and windy from N. West. Nabby and M^{rs} Blanchard went (my H : Ch.) to visit Deacon Jeffries Family 2 Miles. M^{rs} Blanchard din'd with us. I went (my H : and ch.) p. m. to Watertown. Slept and Horse at home. M^{rs} Blanchard with us.

Lord's day. 7th Jan^y. I went alone (my H : and ch) to Watertown. pch'd all day and administer'd Lord's Supper. M^{rs} Cooper, Nabby, and M^{rs} Blanchard din'd at home. Slept and Horse there.

Monday. 8th. M^{rs} Cooper went (my H : and ch) to Roxbury. Nabby and M^{rs} Blanchard din'd at M^{rs} Cockran's. I rode M^r Kory's Horse to Deacon Fisk's and din'd there. We all slept and Horse at home.

Tuesday 9th. Tuesday I din'd at M^r Payne's with M^r Shrimpton Hutchinson, Deacon Storer, Barrell &c. M^{rs} Cooper, Nabby and M^{rs} Blanchard din'd at home. Slept and Horse there. M^r Blanchard sup't with us.

Wednesday. M^{rs} Cooper and I at home all day. Nabby and M^{rs} Blanchard went (my H : and ch) to Watertown, and din'd at Squire Hunts. They return'd in Evg. Slept and Horse at home.

Thursday 11th Jan^y. M^r Blanchard breakfasted with us. He and M^r Blanchard left us at 10 °Clock. carried Nabby (my H : and ch) to Watertown ; she din'd at M^r Hall's. I din'd with M^{rs} Cooper at home. We went (my H and ch) to Mrs Turell's. drank Coffee there. M^r Cook Jun^r with us. Spent Evg. with us. Married this Evg. — — Lush — — Katy Jackson. Fee, 1 Dollar Bill.

Friday. 12. Went (my H : and ch) with M^{rs} Cooper to Deacon Jeffries. I pray'd with her sick. We all din'd at home. Went (my H and ch) With M^{rs} Cooper to Watertown. drank Coffee Deacon Fisk's. slept and H : at home.

Sat. 13. Went with M^{rs} C. (my H : and ch) to Watertown. We all din'd at home. M^{rs} C. went (my H. and ch) p. m. to M^{rs} Durants. I went afterwards in ditto to Watertown. We all drank Coffee and slept and H at home.

Sab: 14 Jany. Went (my H and Ch.) to Watertown. M^{rs} C. and Nabby with me. We din'd at D. Fisk's. Nabby at Mr. Hall's. I pch'd all day. We return'd. Katy went and bro't Nabby after She had drank Coffee M^r Hall's. We all supt slept and H. at home.

Monday. 15. dull rainy day. We all din'd at home. I went a. m. (my H and ch) to Watertown. M^r Cushing call'd upon us p. m. M^r J. Pollard drank Coffee with us. slept and H. at home.

Tuesday 16. Jan^r. Went (my H. and ch) with Mrs. C. to Watertown a. m. We all din'd at home. Went my H and ch. p. m. with Nabby to Watertown. Nabby drank Coffee at M^{rs} Hall's. found at home M^r J. Wheelwright Who drank Coffee and slept with us. slept and H. at home.

Wednesd. 17. M^r J. Wheelwright breakfasted with us. I din'd at M^r Cushing's. went (my H: and ch) pch'd his Lecture. I drank Coffee M^r Paynes. M^r Storer, Barrell, Woodward and B^r Payson there. great Storm of Snow p. m. Nabby and M^{rs} Cooper at home. slept and H: at home.

Thursday 18th. Went Mrs C. (my H: and ch) to Watertown. We all din'd at home. Nabby drank Coffee Mrs. Durants. I went (my H. and ch) p. m. to Watertown. Mrs. C. at home. slept and H. at home. Wrote to Cousin Scott.

Fryday 19. I went Mrs. C. my H: and Ch. to Watertown a. m. Nabby walk'd there. She din'd old Madam Hunts: drank Coffee there: and spent Evg. at Mrs. Cockran's. My Wife and I din'd at home. slept and H: at home.

Sat: 20. M^{rs} C. went my H: and ch to Watertown. She return'd with B^r Cooper who din'd with us. I went with B^r Cooper p. m. my H: ch. to Watertown. Katy went in it to Mr. Durant's afterwards. slept and H: at home. N. B. Shed paid this Day in full for Milk.

Sab. Jan^r. 21. Went (my H: Ch) with M^{rs} C. and Nabby Watertown. we all din'd with B^r and Sister Cooper D. Fisk's. I pch'd a. m. D^r Appleton kindly pch't for me p. m. We drank Coffee at D. Fisk's: Nabby with Miss Polly Johnston at Cap't. Craft's. I married Robert Hughs and Meriam Pearse. Fee, 1 Dollar Bill. slept and H. at home. M^r Clark arriv'd f'm New York.

Monday 22. M^{rs} C. and Nabby went (my H: and ch) to Watertown. Nabby din'd at M^{rs} Cockrans; We at home. M^{rs} C. and I p. m. (in my H: and Ch) to Daw's. pray'd with her. Nabby slept at M^{rs} Cockran's. We, and H: at home.

Tuesday 23. M^{rs} C. and I went (my H: and ch) to Brooklyne. din'd with D^r Chauncey and Lady at M^{rs} Hyslop's. Nabby at M^{rs} Cockran's. M^{rs} Cook came home with Nabby and spent the Evg. slept and H at home.

Wednesday 24. Went with M^{rs} C. my H: and ch to Watertown. I din'd with M^r Gerry, M^r Gordon¹ etc at Squire Hunt's. M^{rs} C. and

¹ The Rev. William Gordon, D.D., minister of the Third Church in Roxbury, and chaplain to the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts. Dr. Cooper had declined to officiate as chaplain of the Congress on account of the state of his affairs. *Journals*, pp. 184, 187.

Nabby at home. M^{rs} C. came with Chaise and bro't me home. Slept : and H : at home.

Thursday. Wrote to D^r Witherspoon,¹ and to M^r S. Adams² at Congress. Nabby went my H : and ch. to Menotomy with Hannah Cook and din'd at her Father's. I walk'd to Watertown din'd at M^m Hunt's. M^{rs} C. at home. We all slept and Horse at home. Wrote this day to M^r Hooker N. Hampton. Newman came with my Goods. M^r Cook part of Evg.

Friday 26. We all din'd at home. Mrs C. went (my H and ch) p. m. to Brown's at little Cambridg. We all slept and H at home.

Sat. 27. M^{rs} C. went (my H : and ch) to little Cambridge. She din'd. Nabby and I din'd at home. we all drank Coffee, slept, and H. at home.

Lord's day. 28th Jan^y. Went (my H and ch) with M^{rs} C. and Nabby to Watertown. pch'd all day there. We din'd at D. Fisk's. Nabby at M^r Hall's : and drank Coffee there. slept and H. at home.

29th Monday. M^{rs} C. and Nabby went my H : and ch. to Enoch Brown's, little Cambridg. They return'd a. m. Cap't Freeman and Wife came to visit us about 12 'Clock and din'd with us. They gave us a fine Leg of Mutton. 2^{lb} Butter. 2^{lb} Coffee. They drank Coffee, supt and slept with us ; their Horse kept with ours. We gave Butter, Mutton and Coffee to Miss Sally.

30. Went with Capt Freeman (my H : and ch) to Watertown. returned a. m. Our Friends din'd with us. They went p. m. with M^{rs} Cooper (my H : and ch) to Watertown, old Madam Hunt's. They supt slept and Horse kept with us.

31. Wednesday. Our Friends Capt. Freeman and Wife breakfasted with us, and left us about 10 °Clock. Mrs. C. and I went about the same Time (my H: and ch.) to Medford. I visited and pray'd with Miss Nanny Payne, sick at Mr Brook's. din'd at M^r Turell's M^{rs} Cooper went on Business towards the Bridge. She din'd, sold twenty silk Handkerchiefs. return'd by Watertown Meeting House. Nabby din'd at home ; where we all Drank Coffee ; slept and Horse.

1. Feb^y Thursday. M^{rs} C. went (my H: and chaise) to Dorchester. on Business. She din'd. Nabby and I at home. D^r Langdon call'd upon me in the Evg. We all slept and H: at home.

2 Feb^y. Friday. Mrs. Cooper went after Breakfast (my H: and ch) to Milton. She din'd. drank Coffee at Sister Gardiner's slept at M^m Foyes. I walk'd to Watertown a. m. din'd at D. Fisk's. Nabby at home. Horse with M^{rs} C. at M^m Foye's.

3. Saturday. Nabby and I din'd at home. M^{rs} Cooper return'd to us in Evg. very cold. We all drank Coffee, supt and H at home.

4. Lord's day. Went with M^{rs} C (my H : and ch) and with Nabby to Watertown. I pch'd there all day. read Proclamation f'm General

¹ The Rev. John Witherspoon, D.D., president of the college of New Jersey, and a delegate to the Continental Congress.

² See extract from a letter of Dr. Cooper of about this date, in *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.* 1875-76, p. 279.

Court for Reformation of Manners in afternoon Sermon; adapted to that Occasion. made Mention of M^{rs} Pitt's Death at Close. We all din'd D. Fisk's. Nabby drank Coffee at M^r Hall's. Mr Cook return'd with her and supt with us. slept and H: at home.

5. *Feb'y. Monday.* M^{rs} C. went (my H: and ch) to Roxbury. Nabby and I din'd at home. M^r Kendall who had been one of D^r Wheelock's¹ Missionaries din'd with me. Slept and H. at home.

6. *Tuesday.* Went with M^{rs} C. (my H: and ch) to Watertown. I pray'd with Bemiss Sons sick. We all din'd at home. Mrs Dennie and Katy Bulfinch din'd with us. M^r Tommy Dennie came p. m. they all drank Coffee and supp'd with us. D^r Roberts spent an Hour with us in Evg. slept and H. at home. Capt Freeman sent us a Peck Beans. gave them to Miss Sally.

7. *Wednesday.* M^{rs} C went (my H: and ch) to Watertown a. m. we all din'd at home. Nabby went with me in the chaise p. m with me to Watertown. M^{rs} Cockran's. She drank Tea there. return'd with me at Sunset. slept. and H. at home.

8. *Thursday.* Light Snow. I went (my H: ch) to Watertown. din'd at Deacon Fisk's; with Mr. Thacher. pray'd at Funeral of Mr. Learned. visited Mrs. Daws. pray'd with her, and Bemiss Family. M^{rs} C. and Nabby at home all day. slept and H. at home.

9. *Friday.* I went my H: and ch, a. m. to visit Sister Cooper unwell. We all din'd at home. I went (my H and ch) to Watertown p. m. slept and H. at home

10. *Saturday.* We all din'd at home. I went (my H and ch) to Watertown p. m. we all slept and H at home

Feb'y. 11th. Lord's day. Went with Nabby my H: and ch. to Watertown. We din'd at D. Fisk's. M^{rs} C. at home. I pch'd all day. baptiz'd 1. *Jonathan* of — return'd and drank Coffee, slept and H. at home.

12. *Monday.* Walk'd to Watertown a. m. We all din'd at home. I carried Nabby (my H: and ch) p. m. to Watertown. She spent Afternoon and Evg. at M^{rs} Craft's. return'd in Evg. slept and H. at home. pray'd in Forenoon with Capt Brown's Daughter, and Bemiss Family.

13. *Tuesday.* Went with M^{rs} C. to M^r Dennies. We din'd there. Nabby at home. M^{rs} Washington, Gates, Mifflin call'd and finding us not at home left th'r names. M^r Scott breakfasted with us. bro't me a letter f'm M^{rs} Scott and Nabby one f'm Sally Chardon. M^{rs} Hyslop call'd p. m. Nabby and Sally spent p. m. at Sister Cooper's. M^r Buckminster call'd in Evg. with Ribbons &c f'm Capt Freeman. slept and H. at home

14. *Wednesday.* Mrs. C. went (my H. and ch) to Medford, about Sale of Ribbons. Nabby and I din'd at home. I visited p. m. on Foot M^r Payne. M^{rs} C. return'd in the Evg. slept and H: at home. Capt Brown sent me 400^{wt} English Hay.

¹The Rev. Eleazar Wheelock (Yale Coll., 1733), founder and first president of Dartmouth College.

15. *Thursday.* M^{rs} C. went (my H: and ch) to Capt: Freeman's Framingham. She slept there. I din'd at M^r Hall's Watertown. went there with M^r Clark, in his chaise; return'd in Deacon Storer's with him and his Son. They spent half an Hour. M^r Wheelwright drank Coffee with us M^r Blanchard call'd afterwards: but did not stay the Evg.

16. *Friday.* M^r Wheelwright Blanchard and Coz Scott breakfasted with us. M^r Wh. and Nabby took an early Dinner at 12, and sat off for Braintree I din'd afterwards with M^r Clark. M^{rs} Cooper return'd p. m. we visited Sister Cooper and M^{rs} Mellicot: drank Coffee at both Places. slept and H. at home.

17. *Saturday.* We din'd at home. Nabby absent. slept and H. at home. I went p. m. to Watertown; to Rogers Clockmaker (in my H: and ch). paid him for mending warming pan.

18. *Lord's day.* very cold. Went with M^{rs} C (my H and ch) to Watertown. din'd at D. Fisk's. I pch'd all day. baptiz'd *Lucy* of David Coolidge.

19. *Monday.* Went with M^{rs} C. (my H. and ch) to little Cambridge by M^r Dennies Invitation; to dine with M^r Hooper. I din'd there, but he sent a Billet of Excuse. M^{rs} C. went to Roxbury and din'd. We return'd in the Evg. Slept and H. at home. pray'd in my Way to M^r Dennies with Wyman's child.

20. *Tuesday.* Went with M^{rs} C. (my H: and ch) to Newtown. we din'd at M^m Gibb's with D^r Chauncey and Lady. call'd in at M^{rs} Hall's. drank Coffee slept and H. at home. Katy went on a Visit to Westown.

21. Went M^{rs} C. (my H: and ch) to Cambridge. I din'd with M^r Leonard at Gen^l Putnam's Quarters. M^{rs} C. din'd. we return'd to Watertown and attended Widow Freeman's Funeral. I pray'd. return'd slept and H at home.

22. *Thursday.* Went with M^{rs} C. (my H: and ch) to Watertown. I pray'd with Capt. Brown's Family. we din'd at home. Capt Brown paid me for my Services as Minister in Watertown 20£ Lawf. Money. visited p. m. M^r Payne's Family. Katy return'd f'm Weston. slept and H. at home.

23. *Fryday.* Went with M^{rs} C. (my H: and ch) to Deacon Fisk's Watertown. I din'd there. M^{rs} C. return'd and din'd at home. She came for me with chaise p. m. we visited M^m Storer. I borrow'd upon Note of Mr. Gill 15£. 18/. L. M. slept and H. at home.

24. *Feb'y. Sat.* M^{rs} C. went my Horse and chaise to Milton for Nabby. M^m Foyes Servant went with a chaise, and brot Nabby to her Mother there. They din'd at M^m Foyes. Nabby return'd to M^m Apthorp's at Braintree, who would not part with her. M^{rs} C. return'd in Evg. I din'd at home this Day. slept and H: at home.

25. *Lord's day.* Went with M^{rs} C. to Watertown. I pch'd all day there. din'd at D. Fisk's. read Proclamation for Fast, on acc't of the War. return'd. slept. and H at home.

26. *Monday.* I went my H: and ch. to Watertown. I pray'd with Amos Bond's Wife sick, return'd and din'd at home. Went p. m.

with M^{rs} C. (my H. and ch) to Sister Cooper's: at D. Livermore's and to M^r Payne's Family. M^r Payne kindly presented me with a new Wig made for himself worth 44/. L. M. slept and H: at home. we drank Coffee at M^r Payne's.

27. *Tuesday*. M^{rs} C. went (my H. and ch) and M^r Kory attended her with his Cart to Roxbury to bring home our Trunks left at M^r William's. it rain'd all day. I went in M^{rs} Cockran's chaise to Capt Brown's. pray'd with his Daughter sick. to M^{rs} Cockran's pray'd there her little Son sick. attended Overseer's Meeting at Council Board. din'd with President, M^r Murray Boothbay &c at M^r Fowle's. return'd home. Mrs C. and M^r Kory came in Evg home with the Trunks. slept and H. at home.

28. *Wednesday*. Went (my H. and ch) to Watertown. din'd at home. went (my H: and ch) p. m to M^{rs} Turell's. Drank Coffee there. paid Wellman for shoeing my Horse 7 /. O. Ten. M^r Bradshaw gave me dressing my Hat 7 /. O. Ten. Snowy Weather. M^r Saml Eliot spent Evg with us. slept and Horse at home.

29. *Feb^l*. M^{rs} C. went (my H: and ch) to Watertown. Patten mended Saddle. We din'd at home. Went p. m. (my H. and ch) to Watertown. I pray'd with M^{rs} Cockran's Son, Amos Bond's Wife, Jonas White. Drank Coffee at Mrs Cockran's. Slept and H at home. D. Storer with his Son and Daught'r. visited us.

March 1. Fryday. We din'd at home. Master Tho^s Thatcher visited us p. m. I went (my H: and ch) to M^r Paynes. slept and H: at home.

2. *Sat:* Went with M^{rs} C. my H: and Ch. to Watertown. We din'd at home. Went p. m. (my H. and Ch) to Saml Whites Son's Funeral. return'd by Deacon Fisk's. Boston Cannonaded and bombarded from our Lines for the first Time this Night. Two of our Mortars split.

3. *Lord's day*. Went my H: and ch. to Watertown. din'd at D. Fisk's. M^{rs} C. came in my chaise sent back for her after Dinner. pch'd all day and administer'd. no Firing f'm our Lines to day: but begun about 1 °Clock at Night. continued till Morn^g. The fine brass Mortar call'd the Congress crack'd.¹

4. An Alarm that the King's Forces were coming f'm Boston to Cambridg, but groundless. Sent off Nabby's Trunks to M^r Miliquets. Went there with M^{rs} C. my H. and ch. f'm thence to Watertown. we din'd at home. went p. m. to Watertown. call'd at M^{rs} Storer's. This and all the near Towns round us call'd into the Lines. Preparations making by our Army to take Possession of Dorchester Heights and Point. M^r Kory and Son and M^r Clarke all gone to the Army. last took Possession—Dorchester Hill.¹

¹ Cf. Diary of Ezekiel Price, *l. c.*, p. 240.

² See Washington to the President of Congress, March 7, ed. Sparks, III. 302; Letters of Ebenezer Huntington, in AM. HIST. REV., V. 708, 709; Robert Pierpont to James Bowdoin, March 5, in *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, sixth series, IX. 393, 394; Timothy Newell's Journal, *ibid.*, fourth series, I. 272; General Gates to John Adams, March 8, in *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 1875-76, p. 281; Diary of Ezekiel Price, *ibid.*, 1863-64, p. 240; Diary of John Rowe, *ibid.*, second series, X. 94, 95; Diary of John Tudor, pp. 60, 61.

5. *Tuesday.* Went with M^{rs} C. (my H: and ch) to Watertown. M^r Thatcher¹ pronounc'd Oration—for horrid Massacre. I pray'd on that Occasion in Meeting House. din'd with Inhabitants of Boston at M^{rs} Coolidge's Tavern. M^{rs} C. din'd at M^r Dennie's. we return'd home in Evg. slept and H. at home.

6. *Wednesday.* Very high Wind and Rain at South last Night continu'd windy all day. General Howe's Troops went yesterday f'm Boston to the Castle intending an attack on our Troops at 5 °Clock this Morn^g. prevented by the Wind. I went to Watertown, (my H: and ch) to attend Corporation Meeting at D^r Appleton's Lodgings. could not reach there with D^r Winthrop in my Chaise on Acc't of bad Roads. return'd and din'd at home. slept and H. there.

7. *March. Thursday.* Fast appointed by Gen^l Court thro the Colony. I pch'd all day at Watertown. M^{rs} C. went with me (my H: and Ch) she went after Service p. m. to Mrs. Cockran's and drank Coffee there. I went with D. Fisk (my H: and Ch) to M^r Bright's Funeral. pray'd there. return'd slept and H: at home.

8. *Friday.* Went to have my Chaise mended at Whitney's Watertown. din'd at home. Went (my H: and ch) p. m. with Mrs. C. to Watertown. pray'd at Widow Sanger's Child's Funeral. slept and H. at home. heard by a Cap't of Vessell who escap'd f'm Boston last Night, that the Troops there were preparing to embark and leave the Place. Letter f'm Selectmen² remaining in Boston to Gen^l Wash—about cannonading the Town &c. slept and H. at home

9. *Sat.* Went a. m. with M^{rs} C. (my H: and Ch) to Watertown. we din'd at home. went (my H: and ch) p. m. to visit M^r Hammond sick. He had just expir'd. I pray'd with the Family. on Return we call'd at Sister Cooper's and M^r Payne's. slept and H: at home.

10. *Lord's day.* Went with M^{rs} C. my H: and Ch. to Watertown. we din'd at D. Fisk's. I pch'd all day there. went after Service p. m M^r Dennies. inform'd of the great Cannonading last Night to and from Boston. a Surgeon and 3 Privates kill'd at Dorchester Hill, by one Cannon Ball f'm Boston. slept and H at M^r D^r's. No Thundring f'm Cannon to Night.

11th *March. Mond.* Went with M^r Tho^s Dennie (his H: and ch) to Cambridg. waited on Gen^l Washington and Lady, Gates &c. convers'd with the Gen^l and Gates about the Manner of our taking Possession of Boston s'd the Enemy leave it. more Accts of the Preparation of the Enemy to depart. Preparations on our Side for Troops to march towards N. York, as the Enemy expected to go tht way. Return'd with M^r Th. D. to Jackson's Tavern: din'd there, according to Invitation 3. Days ago, with Selectmen of Cambridg. open'd about 3 °Clock their Annual Town Meeting with Pray'r. M^{rs} Cooper din'd at M^r Dennies. return'd with her. drank Coffee slept and H. at home.

¹ Peter Thacher, D.D. (H. C. 1769), minister of Malden. In 1785 he succeeded Dr. Cooper as pastor of Brattle Street Church.

² See Sparks, Washington's *Writings*, III. 531-532; Timothy Newell's *Journal*, . c., pp. 292, 293.

12. *Tues.* We din'd at home. went with B^r Cooper his H. and ch. p. m. to Watertown. M^{rs} C. (my H: and ch) to Mrs Turell's. drank Coffee there. Slept and H: at home.

13. *Wedn.* Went (my H: and ch) to Wellmans. My Horse fore Shoes sat. paid him. On Return home found Nabby from Braintree with M^r Blanchard: after being absent 3. Weeks and 5 days . . B^r Lathrop f'm Providence din'd with us. went p. m. (my H. and ch) to Watertown. paid Whitney 10/. O. Ten^r for mending Harness. slept and H. at home. Receiv'd late M^r Hunts Sermons by his Brother with Letter f'm B^r Hooker.

14. *Thursday.* We din'd at home. I went p. m. my H. and ch to Watertown. slept and H: at home. no Cannonading for Several Nights. further Accts of British Troops preparing to leave Boston.

15. I went to Watertown a. m. (my H: and ch) Col. Johonnot return'd and din'd with us, on a Haddock. purchas'd by me. Hay f'm Hagar this morn^s. W^t-paid M^r Korey this Evg. for keeping my Horse this Week past, 30/. O. Ten^r and for Meal ditto. slept and H. at home.

16. *Sat.* M^r Sergeant f'm Stock-bridge visited me a. m. D^r Witherspoon's eldest Son (with M^r Pidgeon Jun^r) bro't me a Letter f'm his Father. We din'd at home without any Company. I went p. m. to Watertown (my H: and ch). M^r Korey bro't me a Letter f'm Post Office Cambridge, paid him 10/. O. Ten^r Postage.

17. *March. Lord's day.* Went with Nabby (my H: and ch) to Watertown. M^{rs} C. at home unwell. pch'd there all day. We din'd at D. Fisk's. saw D. Newell after Service p. m. at M^r Hall's Watertown. He gave us an Acc't f'm Boston that the British Army had left it,¹ of the great Plunder on the House Furniture and Goods of the Inhabitants; and of my own in particular. slept and Horse at home.

18. *Monday.* Carried Nabby (my H: and ch) to Watertown M^r Cockran's She din'd there. return'd and went with M^{rs} C. to Fratingham's for mending Chaise. He not at home. went to D. Fisk's. I din'd there, M^{rs} C. ate no Dinner, unwell. Return'd home took Nabby with us slept and H: at home.

19. *Tuesday.* Nabby and M^{rs} C. went (my H: and ch) to Boston. Carried to D^r Bulfinch q^r Veal, 2^{lb} Butter 2 Doz Eggs, to Glasgow Gallon of Milk and some Indian Meal. They saw D^r B. Children, He and his Wife having gone to Braintree. They visited our House, found it robb'd of a great Part of my Furniture. They return'd home. I walk'd to M^r Payne's a. m. and to Watertown p. m. slept and H. at home.

20. *Wed.* Mrs C. went alone (my H: and ch) to Boston saw D B. and Wife, visited Friends and our House. Bro't me a Pint Bottle red Lavendar and 2 Bottles of English Ale f'm Molly and Betty Minot. M^r Scott and Serv't Dick din'd with me at M^r Clark's. went p. m. with M^r Scott to Watertown in his Chaise. walk'd home. slept and H. at home.

¹ Diary of John Tudor, p. 62.

21. *Thursday.* M^{rs} C. went (my H : and ch). with Nabby to Watertown. Nabby din'd at M^{rs} Hall's. M^{rs} C. went to Cambridg. return'd and din'd at home. visited p. m. by Deacon Tainter, M^r Payne and Ned Green. I went in my Chaise p. m. to Watertown. wrote Letters this Morn^g by M^r Hyde Carrier to D^r Franklin, Col Hancock, M^m Hancock. slept and H : at home

22. *Friday.* M^{rs} C. went my H : and ch to Watertown to Billings Tailor about my Cloaths. return'd a. m. Mr. Gannet call'd and din'd with us. I went p. m. my H : and ch to Watertown. slept and H : at home.

23. *Sat : March.* I went a. m (my H. and ch) to Watertown. M^{rs} C. went p. m. (my H : and ch) to Weston M^{rs} Savage's. Bro't our Plate &c. Slept and H : at home ; we din'd at home.

24. *Lord's day.* Went my H : and ch. with M^{rs} C. and Nabby to Watertown. we din'd at D. Fisk's, Nabby at M^{rs} Cockran's. I pch'd there all day. we return'd home, and sent the chaise back for Nabby who drank Tea at M^{rs} Halls. slept and Horse at home.

25. *Monday.* M^{rs} C. took Nabby in my (H : and ch) to Boston. John Korey carried Katy on the black mare to the same Place. I din'd at home. walk'd p. m. to Mr Payne's. found Mrs Cooper at home on my Return in the Evg. She left Nabby and Katy at home getting our House into Order. They slept at the Mss. Minots.

26. *Tuesday.* Went with M^{rs} C. my (H : and ch) to Boston. a melancholy Scene. Many Houses pull'd down by the British Soldiery. the Shops all shut. Marks of Rapine and Plunder evr'y where. we din'd at D^r Bulfinch's with Nabby, Cap't Freeman, M^r Barrell. visited p. m. my House. found all my Beds Bedsteds, Sheets Blankets Quilts and Coverlids, all my China Glass and Crockery Ware, &c &c, plunder'd, 2 Lookin Glasses gone 2 broke, 1 Dressing Glass gone &c. Mrs C. and I supt and slept at D^r Bulfinch's. Nabby and Katy at Mss. Minots. my Horse kept there

27. *Wednesday.* Went with M^{rs} C. to our House. procur'd an Order f'm General Green to take Furniture f'm deserted Houses, agreeably to the Leave granted me yesterday on my Petition to Gen^l. Court,¹ to supply my desolated empty House with Furniture f'm Dwellings left by the Enemies to our Country. remov'd some Things from Paxton's² and Richard Smith's³ House by Aid of M^r J. Pollard who saw all that was taken. I din'd at D. Storer's, M^{rs} C. at her Brother's, Nabby at Minots. bo't a Q^r Pork, 52/. M^{rs} C. and I slept at D^r Bulfinch's. Nabby and Katy at Minots. Horse there.

28. *Thursday.* All our Family went to Thursday Lect : open'd by D^r Eliot. General Washington and all the General Officers present.

¹ *Resolves, Mass., III. 30 ; Force's Archives, fourth series, V. 1265.*

² Charles Paxton, commissioner of the customs in Boston. He was proscribed, banished, and his estate confiscated.

³ Richard Smith was a protester against the Solemn League and Covenant and an addresser of Hutchinson in 1774.

Din'd with them and a great Number of Gentlemen at Bunch of Grapes Tavern. Dinner prepar'd by Committee of General Court. Walk'd with the Generals &c. after Dinner to Fort Hill. Cap't Erving¹ gave me Liberty to take some Furniture f'm M^r Moffatt's House; M^r Newman helped me in the Removal. M^{rs} C. and I slept at D^r Bulfinch's. Nabby din'd at M^{rs} Pollard's, M^{rs} C. at her Brother's. Nabby and Katy slep't at Miss Minots. Horse there.

29. *Friday*. Still employ'd in removing Things to my House. din'd with Gen^l Green at Mr. Bromfield's. M^{rs} C. at home. Nabby at Miss Pollard's. M^r W^m Newman aided in removing. M^{rs} C. and I slept at D^r B'. Nabby and Katy at Miss Minots. Horse there.

30. *Saturday*. My Family employ'd in preparing Things in our House. They all din'd there. I at Miss Minot's. Nabby and Katy slept at home. M^{rs} C. and I came our H: and a chaise procur'd for me by D. Bulfinch to Waltham. we slept and H: at M^r Clark's there.

31. *Lord's day*. M^{rs} C. and I went (my H: and ch) to Watertown I pch'd there all day. pray'd at Funeral of M^{rs} Storer's only child, a young Man of 20 Years. We din'd at D. Fiske's. slept and H. at M^r Clark's.

April 1. Monday. Went with M^{rs} C. my H: and ch. to Boston. p. m. chaise broke by Major Thompson's Brooklyne. borrow'd his. left mine at Child's Blacksmith. slept with Mrs. C. at Miss Minots. Horse at Cap't Ervings.

2. I din'd at D. Newell's. M^{rs} C. at our House. slept with M^{rs} C. at Miss Minot's. Horse at D. Storer's.

3. Went with M^{rs} C. to Watertown. Corporation and Overseer's Meeting there. Din'd at Mrs. Coolidges with College Gentlemen. went p. m. to Waltham with M^{rs} C. who din'd at D. Fisk's. slept at M^r Clark's. Horse there on my Hay.

4. *Thursday*. We din'd at home; Sign'd Diploma for Gen^l Washington's Doctorate of Laws.² went to Cambridg p. m. to wait on him and take Leave; found him set out for Boston, and f'm thence to N. York. slept and H. at M^r Clark's, on his Hay.

5. *Friday*. M^{rs} C. went alone my H: and ch to Boston. She din'd at our House. I walk'd to Watertown din'd at Mr Hall's. walk'd back to M^r Clark's where M^{rs} C. return'd. slept and H: there on M^r Clark's Hay.

6. *Saturday*. Went with M^{rs} C. my Horse and ch to Boston. I din'd at D. Storer's. slept with M^{rs} C. and my Family for the first Time in my own House Horse at D. Storer's.

¹ John Erving sat in the Council of Massachusetts for many years prior to the Revolution. He was born in 1690, at Kirkwall, in the Orkneys, and died in Boston in 1786, aged 96. At the time of his death he was probably the richest merchant in New England. His eldest son, John Erving, Jr., was a Mandamus Councillor and Loyalist refugee. One daughter married Governor Bowdoin; another, Governor Scott, of Dominica; yet another, Duncan Stewart, Collector at New London before the Revolution.

² The degree of LL.D. had not been previously conferred by Harvard College, except in the case of Professor John Winthrop, F.R.S., a graduate of the class of 1732, upon whom it was bestowed three years earlier.

7. *Lord's day.* Pch'd all day at O. Brick ; (D^r Chauncy unwell and not come to Town) to a large Assembly especially p. m. when I deliver'd Occasional Sermon. have not pch'd in Boston before since 10th of last April. slept at home ; Horse at M^r Storer's.

8. *Monday.* M^{rs} C. Nabby and I invited to dine at Capt Erving's and M^r Storer's. They excus'd themselves. I din'd at Cap't Erving's: Pray'd p. m. in King's Chappel over D^r Warren's Corpse, bro't f'm Charlestown by free Masons to be reinterr'd. a vast Concourse.¹ M^r Morton² deliver'd Funeral Eulogium. slept at home. Horse at D. Storer's.

9. *Tuesday.* We all din'd at home. Slept Horse for first Time at Mrs Turell's. D. Smith bro't me 25 £ O. Ten^r Sabbath's Contrib.

10. I din'd at D^r Bulfinch's with Parson Parker M^r Timmin's &c. M^{rs} [C.] Carried Nabby, my H: and ch to Watertown. she slept at M^r Hall's. M^{rs} Cooper return'd. we slept at home. H. at M^r Turell's.

11. We din'd at home. Nabby still at M^r Halls. Horse at M^r Turell's.

12. *Friday.* We din'd at home. H: at M^r T.

13. *April. Saturday.* I went my H: ch. to bring Nabby f'm Watertown. we din'd at Mr. Hall's. came home p. m. slept at home. H. at M^r T.

14. *Lord's day.* pch'd all day at O. Brick. D^r Chauncy not come to Town. Large Assemblies.

15. *Monday.* Din'd at home. Deacon Newell bro't me yesterday's Contribution—18 £ O. Ten^r. Slept at home. H. at Mr Turell's.

16. *Rainy.* din'd at home. Slept. Horse at M^r T.

17. *Wednesday.* Went with M^{rs} C. (my H: and ch) to Waltham ; din'd in our Way at M^r Dennie's little Cambridg. slept at Mr. Clark's. Horse on my own Hay there.

18. *Thursday.* Left Mr Clark's after Breakfast. din'd at Deacon Fisk's. came home. Sally Chardon drank Tea with us. H. at M^r Turells

19. Din'd at home. slept and H. at M^{rs} T.

20. Din'd with M^r Boyer at old Mr Johonnot's. M at M^r T.

21. *Lord's day.* Exchang'd Mr Lothrop (D^r Pemberton's House)³ a. m. pch'd at O Brick p. m. Sally Chardon din'd and slept with us. Deacon Jeffries and M^r W^m Newman supp'd with us. H. at Mr T.

22. *Monday.* Deacon Newell bro't yesterday's Contribution. 18 £ O. T. Sally Chardon din'd and slept with us. H. at M^r T.

23. *Tuesday.* Went with Mrs C. a. m. to Watertown Corporation and Overseer's Meeting. I din'd with Corporation at Learned's Tavern. Instructors of College gave in a written Declaration to the

¹ See Diary of John Rowe, *l. c.*, p. 99.

² Perez Morton, from 1810 to 1832 attorney-general of Massachusetts.

³ The Old North Meeting-house (the church of the Mathers), over which the Rev. John Lathrop was settled, had been "pulled down by order of Genl Howe for fuel for the Refugees and Tories".—Journal of Timothy Newell, *l. c.*, p. 271.

Overseers of their political Principles. slept at M^r Clark's. Horse on his Hay.

24. *Wednesday.* Went (my H: and ch) with M C to Framingham. Din'd at Cap't Freeman's slept and H: there.

25. Din'd at Capt Freeman's: Drank Coffee at Mr Habij^l Savages. slept at Capt. Freeman's H: there. Sally Chardon left our House.

26. Left Capt Freemans after Breakfast. I din'd at Watertown Mr Bemis's. M^{rs} C. We call'd at Mr. Dennies. slept at home. H: at Mr T.

27. M^{rs} Cooper taken ill of a Fever p. m.

Lord's day. Apr. 28. D^r Chauncey pch'd, a. m. I p. m. D. Newell bro't my part of Contribution. 13: 19: 3. O Ten^r.

Friday 4th [3] May. D^r Chauncey pch'd Friday Lecture M^{rs} C. dangerously ill.

Lord's day. 6 [5] May. Dr. Chauncey pch'd and administer'd. I pch'd p. m. M^{rs} C. very ill.

Monday. D. Newell bro't my part of Contribution. 8—18—1. O. Ten^r.

Lord's day. 13th [1st] D^r Chauncey pch'd a. m. I p. m.

Monday. 14. [13]. D. Williams bro't my half of Contribution—7—5—2. O Ten^r.

Friday, 17 May. Continental Fast.¹ D^r Chauncey a. m. I p. m. gave Notice in publick that divine Service w'd be perform'd by divine Leave in our Meeting-house ² next Lord's day.

2. Letter of John Quincy Adams, 1811.

For the following document we are indebted to Dr. James Westfall Thompson, of the University of Chicago. It is a dispatch sent by John Quincy Adams to the Department of State during the time when he was Minister in Russia. The manuscript, which is in the possession of Mr. Frederick M. Steele of Chicago, was secured in London. It is believed to have been intercepted by a British cruiser claiming to exercise the right of search. The portions comprised in brackets were written in cipher, and have been translated for Doctor Thompson by a clerk in the Department of State. The translation had to be made out, syllable by syllable, from old letters, on file among the early records, in which the same cipher is used; for the Department does not possess a copy of the cipher code then employed. For the subject-matter, see *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, Vol. II., *passim*.

¹ *Journals*, 1776, p. 93; *Diary of John Tudor*, p. 63.

² During the siege, Brattle Street Church had been used by the British "for a barracks".

ADAMS TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

N. 70.

ST. PETERSBURG, 3. October 1811.

The Secretary of State
of the United States

Sir :

I have furnished the French Ambassador, as he requested, with a list of the American vessels which have arrived this year at Cronstadt, and have sailed again for the United States. I have also sent a copy of the same list to Mr. Russell at Paris, by a courier despatched last Monday by Count Lauriston ; and have mentioned to Mr. Russell in a letter the motive upon which it was requested—to obtain a more speedy liberation of any of them which might be captured by the French privateers said to be stationed at the passage of the Sound. When the Courier was despatched I had already heard that Mr. Barlow had sailed from Annapolis for France, and I learn this morning that he arrived the 6th of last month at Cherbourg. Having understood from Mr. Russell that it was his intention to leave Paris immediately after the Minister should arrive, I have requested that Mr. Barlow would in that case open the letter, addressed to Mr. Russell. I hope there will be no capture of any of the vessels, to make the interposition of either of those gentlemen, with the French Government, necessary to obtain their release. But if there should, I shall be happy to find the good intentions of the Ambassador in asking for the list realized, by its contributing to their immediate liberation. I am not inclined to suspect any unfriendly intention towards us, as having contributed in the slightest degree to this request. There is a frankness and good humor in the character of the Ambassador, in which deep dissimulation is not congenial. He has often very freely and explicitly avowed to me his wish for a war between the United States and England. Having in my own nature as little dissimulation, as I think observable in his, I have never pretended in this respect to coincide with him in sentiment ; [but I have more than once suggested to him that if his Government really wished that war should be the result of English ill-usage towards the United States, it was a strange way of manifesting that desire to rivalize with England in acts of the like ill-usage, and I have not scrupled to avow to him that so long as France should continue to hold towards us such a course of conduct, it was my opinion that neither the people nor the Government of the United States would engage themselves in a war which would be so conformable to her views and policy.] He has assured me in strong terms of *his own* wish that his Government should do us justice, and his disposition to write anything that might be proper to promote the same temper there ; and I am willing to believe that this was his real and principal inducement for asking the information contained in this list. [At the same time I am aware that it *might* be for purposes of an opposite nature and I know that the French Minister of Foreign Affairs has informed the French Consul here that he

had received advices that much English property had been introduced here under the American flag, and has enjoined upon him a most vigilant attention and a report how the fact in this respect was. The report which was sent by the same courier with my letter I have reason to believe was as favorable so far as concerns Americans as the truth would warrant. The Consul] has declared to me his opinion that every vessel which has arrived this year at Cronstadt *with a cargo* under any other than American colours, was loaded on English account. The number of those vessels however amounts only to eleven. As to the Americans he assured me that he fully credited the statement which I made verbally to him in conversation, and that he would report accordingly to his Government. I told him that, independent of any credit which he might be disposed to give me from confidence, he might observe that the *interest* of my countrymen trading here was impulse enough for them and me to detect as much as we could the counterfeit who came as their competitors in the market, and as to the introduction of English property here, I asked his attention to two facts which in my mind amounted to complete demonstration that its amount had really been very small. The first was that during the whole season no insurance had been obtainable in London, upon shipments of goods to Russian ports in the Baltic, and the other that the course of exchange had constantly been from fifty to sixty per cent. against England and in favour of Russia. He admitted the weight of these facts, of the first of which he had not been aware ; and he said he should not fail to avail himself of both in his report. Of the American vessels, thirty-three came in ballast, and I presume were either freighted in England, or came here for freights to England. In all these cases the Government here have scarcely wished to look at the Papers. Mr. [Gurieff, the Minister (of) Finance, to whose Department this matter now belongs, once told me in express terms that if a ship came empty he did not care whence she came, and was not inclined to scrutinize what she was.] This disposition obtained admission for the Crescent, though reported by Mr. Harris as irregular, and came very near carrying through the Angerona, when the Captain lost his papers to secure their forgery from detection. [The Ambassador and Consul know very well that these ships that came in ballast will return bound to England for whatever port they may have cleared out. When they have been real Americans I have not felt myself obliged to be more scrupulous in enquiring whence they came than the Russian Government ; it was not my duty to accuse them nor to point them out by any discrimination from the rest. They will] doubtless [return as they came under convoy, and will be in very little danger of capture either by French or Danish privateers. Their freightings are certainly profitable to the general mass of our commerce, but I think it necessary to say *to you* that abuse of our flag is more difficult to detect in their trading than in the case of forgery. I have my suspicions that in more than one instance of those that came this summer, altho' the vessel and papers and even the master and crew were really American,

the property was English ; and I am not sure there were not cases in which everything was English but the papers. I feel my whole bounden duty therefore once more to suggest the expediency of further legislative provision against the sale of real American ships papers whether (with) or without the ship in foreign ports.]

There have been indeed several cases of American vessels, which came with *Cargoes* last from England ; the admission of which I have obtained. But they have all been accompanied with proof that they were dispatched from the United States, and bound here, and that they have been detained in English ports, either by capture, by stress of weather, or by the necessity of repairing or *changing* the ship. The proofs have been clear. I have interfered without hesitation, and in every instance have obtained their admission. I know also of several instances in which vessels under similar circumstances obtained admission without my interference. [There have been so many of them in all that possibly other causes than mere compulsion made some of them touch at English ports. I know that before the navigation opened this Government received notice from Mr. Daschkoff that a large proportion of the American vessels coming to Russia this season would take England in their way. This was not forbidden by any law of the United States. How far it was compatible with the law of Russia was for this Government to determine. I never disguised or even concealed a fact from them which could bear upon the principle when I asked for a favour or an exemption from the rigour of the Ukaze, and many vessels have been admitted which the rigour of the Ukaze would have excluded. It is not probable that any further questions of this nature will occur the present year, and it is too (ear)ly to look forward for the ruling principles of the next, but it is not too soon to say that the safety of our real commerce with Russia may still depend upon its discrimination from the imposture which assumes its garb.]

My quarterly account is enclosed, with which I have still to repeat the request at the close of my letter N. 57, dated 6 July last.

I am, with great respect, Sir,

Your very hu^{bl} and obd^t serv^t.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great. By J. B. BURY, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Dublin. (London: Macmillan and Co. 1900. Pp. xxiii, 909.)

THERE are already so many good histories of Greece that the inquisitive public asks each newcomer to explain first of all why he was born. Though in his preface Mr. Bury does not offer the much desired apology, a glance at his book shows the main feature to be his novel treatment of prehistoric Greece. Undoubtedly the recent researches of Mr. Evans and other archaeologists have added much to our knowledge of that early age; the simple question is whether Mr. Bury has successfully adapted this new information to the already known facts.

While as a rule authorities now agree that the Mycenaean civilization flourished as early as 1500 B. C., recent discoveries make it appear probable that this culture was preceded by more primitive stages, which reached back perhaps a thousand years further into the past. Mr. Bury, then, is safe in dating the beginnings of the Ægean civilization from the third millenium B. C. His assertion, however, that this civilization preceded the arrival of the Greeks in their historic home is pure speculation; for archaeology does not distinguish races; we should not confound areas of civilization with ethnological groups. But Mr. Bury rests his faith on a few names of places. "Corinth and Tiryns, Parnassus and Olympus, Arne and Larisa, are names which the Greeks received from the peoples whom they dispossessed." While it is possible to make all sorts of guesses as to the origin of this or that word, no one can prove that the names in his list are not as thoroughly Greek as any in the language. Indeed it is most improbable that before the arrival of the Greeks, any one language extended over the coasts and islands of the Ægean Sea. We could more reasonably assume a multitude of dialects with little or no relation to one another.

Mr. Bury attempts, further, to trace the migrations, conquests, and settlements of various races in Greece through the third and second millennia B. C. To those who are acquainted with our lack of knowledge of this subject it is needless to say that his whole treatment is purely conjectural. Even his positive assertions are either extremely doubtful or absolutely wrong. "We know," he says "that there were Pelasgians in Thessaly and in Attica." Rather we are almost certain there were no Pelasgians in Attica. He has also a theory, the product of his imagination, that most of the historic Atticans were non-Hellenic, that the Ionian

(or Javonic) invaders, though Greek, were very few. The evanescent nature of such speculation appears from the fact that before his book is through the press, he declares that neither the name nor the nation of Javones (Ionians) is Greek ! But anything may be expected of a writer who accepts as history the evident fiction that the Cyprian Salamis was settled from the Salamis off the Attic coast. The fact is that so far as these early chapters indicate, Mr. Bury has not advanced beyond the childish methods of the ancient Greeks ; he has not taken his first lesson in sound historical criticism. As a result of this lack of training, his chapters on the prehistoric age are a series of groundless or untenable hypotheses.

His treatment of constitutional history is equally faulty ; we constantly happen upon statements which we are compelled to doubt or deny. The village was not, as he asserts, a *genos* (gens) ; the gens was not a primitive institution, and is not mentioned by Homer. There is no evidence that the *phyle* ever existed as an independent kingdom, or that the common people were ever excluded from the phratries, or that Solon established a "Council of Four Hundred and One." And it is not probable that this statesman provided for filling offices by a "mixed method of election and lot." It is difficult for the reader to understand, too, how an artificial tribal system introduced from Miletus could at the same time be "based on birth." Much else might be offered to show how confused is Mr. Bury's mind on various topics which are clearly and accurately treated in other books. Considerable stretches of his work, however, show contact with fresh German scholarship. The admirer of Busolt will find much in this new history to remind him of his old friend. Undoubtedly it is a merit in Mr. Bury to have depended on so good an authority ; but he could have done his countrymen a better service by translating Busolt or Beloch into English ; for these historians represent something substantial, and their works, therefore, have a lasting value.

G. W. B.

A History of Greece. By EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D., Jowett Lecturer in Greek History at Balliol College. Part III. From the Thirty Years' Peace to the Fall of the Thirty at Athens, 445-403 B. C. (London : Longmans. New York : Putnams. 1900. Pp. viii, 561.)

PART I. of this history, which appeared in 1888, extends to the Ionian Revolt ; Part II., published four years afterward, reaches the Treaty of 445 B. C. ; and the present volume not only continues the narrative to the fall of the Thirty at Athens, 403 B. C., but also includes a chapter on the literature, art, religion, and society of the Greeks in the fifth century. Though the first five chapters have been taken with some modifications from Mr. Abbott's well known work on Pericles, the remainder of the book is entirely new.

The author tells us that his history "is intended for readers who are acquainted with the outlines of the subject, and have some knowledge of the Greek language. It has been written in the belief that an intelligible sketch of Greek civilization may be given within a brief compass—not in the hope of throwing new light on old obscurities, or quoting fresh evidence where all the evidence has been long ago collected." In accordance with this plan of preparing a work for the general student of Greek civilization, the author rarely cites authorities or discusses the relative value of the ancient sources. On the other hand, the compass of his history, which is much wider than he at first designed, enables him to consider all the important events, yet with far greater brevity than Grote and Curtius have employed.

The most marked characteristic of the author is his sober, colorless statement of facts, or of what he believes to be facts. Avoiding premature hypotheses, he studiously reproduces the view of those ancient writers who are usually set down as most conservative and reliable. At the same time the arrangement of the material is admirable throughout; and the language, though without ornament or feeling, is uniformly clear. These qualities, with the good index at the end of each volume, make his history an excellent work of reference for all who are interested in ancient Greece. Most readers, however, will find more to attract them in Grote, or Curtius, or even in Holm, for these writers have put their souls into their work. We miss in Abbott not only the partisan fervor of Grote but also the delicate emotion for landscape, art, and character which distinguishes Curtius. While Holm is fresh and suggestive, in Abbott we rarely find a new idea; he has sacrificed brilliancy of every kind to scholarly reserve.

It is a question whether this reserve should be considered an unqualified virtue. In the present volume, for instance, Mr. Abbott invariably accepts Thucydides's estimate of men and of events. There can be no reasonable doubt, however, that the great Greek historian was prejudiced against the democratic leaders of Athens after Pericles. Certainly Cleon and Hyperbolus were not so thoroughly bad as Thucydides represents them to be. It is the duty of the impartial historian, accordingly, to attempt to place these men in their true light; and the task is extremely difficult, for Thucydides has a subtle way of concealing his partisanship. Again, it hardly seems reasonable to assume that Thucydides is in all points infallible, that the scholar is bound to follow him blindly, whenever he disagrees with other authorities. But Mr. Abbott in his treatment of the Four Hundred refuses to learn anything from Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*, because (1) Thucydides was contemporary, and (2) his narrative is vivid and impressive whereas that of Aristotle is confused. These reasons are not in themselves convincing; for every one knows that the later historian, with his opportunity for the study of documents, has an advantage over a contemporary whose knowledge is perhaps mere hearsay. It is well known, too, that Greek and Roman history

has suffered much from scholars whose literary taste has led them to judge the accuracy of a writer by the quality of his style.

This criticism of the author's method should by no means be taken as a condemnation of his work. The reader of the present volume understands that he is following Thucydides ; and if it is his wish to view political parties and leaders at Athens from the standpoint of a great though prejudiced contemporary, he may consider himself fortunate in having so faithful and so trustworthy a guide as Mr. Abbott. In brief the work is remarkably careful and accurate ; and the merit of the volumes which have thus far appeared inspires the hope that the entire history will fill a large sphere of positive usefulness.

G. W. B.

A History of England for the Use of Schools and Academies. By J. N. LARNED, with Topical Analyses, Research Questions and Bibliographical Notes, by Homer P. Lewis, Principal of the English High School, Worcester, Mass. (Boston : Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1900. Pp. xxxiii, 673.)

IN his preface Mr. Larned states that his aim in writing this book has been to tell "the things most essential with simple clearness, in such an order and so connectedly as to show streams of influence and cause flowing through them," so that the reader may feel himself led "easily along the main lines of development that flow through English history." This has been done with a considerable degree of success. The subject-matter is divided into seven periods: Britain and Early England ; The Norman-English Nation ; The Decline of Feudalism ; Renaissance and Reformation ; A Century of Revolution ; The Period of Aristocratic Government ; and The Democratic Era ; and these are handled in such a way as to present a narrative of the nation's development that is both consecutive and interesting, and possesses more literary merit than one often finds in a text-book. The array of wars—both foreign and domestic,—and the intricacies of the royal genealogies are happily subordinated to the constitutional, social, and industrial development of the people, and the territorial expansion of the nation, while the lines of such development are well-defined. That a few of the estimates of character—both of individuals and of nations—are emphatic rather than judicial, it would be difficult to deny. Elizabeth's greatness is scantily recognized ; and the author gives us the impression that "no good thing can come out of" Spain.

Of the seven periods enumerated, The Century of Revolution (1603–1688) is treated with the greatest detail. To it are given 106 pages, while the period 1450–1603 covers 77 pages, and that from 1688 to 1820, 94 pages.

There are interpolated, at various intervals throughout the text, Surveys of General History,—one for the first seven centuries following the fall of Rome, and one for each century after the twelfth. These are in-

tended for the use of the teacher rather than for that of the pupil, and they would seem to add little to the usefulness of the volume. They are too brief to help the pupil, and a well-equipped teacher would regard them as superfluous.

Each chapter is followed by topics giving a synopsis of the text, accompanied by references for further reading, prepared by Mr. Homer P. Lewis, Principal of the English High School at Worcester, Mass. These references are selected—so Mr. Larned says in his preface—with regard to adaptability for school use. The list is by no means complete. Such works as Prothero's *Select Statutes and Other Documents* and Gardiner's *Documents of the Puritan Revolution* should surely find a place among any working list of books upon English history. A list of references should also make some distinction between original and secondary material. The book has an excellent index. The maps are commendable, and the illustrations are well-chosen, if not always well-executed.

GERTRUDE S. KIMBALL.

The Welsh People. By JOHN RHYS and DAVID BRYNMOR JONES.
(New York: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Pp. xxvi, 678.)

THE title of this work is skilfully chosen to cover a variety of subjects. The book consists partly of extracts from the *Report of the Royal Commission on Land* in Wales and Monmouthshire, and partly of new matter written later. The additional chapters make up about half the volume, which deals with the ethnology, political and economic history, constitutional law, language and literature, and finally the educational and religious conditions of the Welsh people. If it purported to be a history of Wales, the choice of subjects might appear arbitrary and the treatment sometimes disproportionate. But the book is rather to be judged as a series of chapters embodying contributions to such a history, and the contributions are valuable.

The authors begin by dealing pretty fully with the ethnology of Wales, and incidentally with that of England and Ireland. They show that the race, or rather people, commonly termed Celtic is of very mixed origin, and they conclude that the blood of a "pre-Aryan" population predominates in the modern Welshman. This pre-Aryan people they hold to have survived in the historic Picts, and in a long chapter on the Pictish question they present very fully the arguments for their view. The opinion that the Picts were non-Aryan in race and speech undoubtedly holds the field at present, as they maintain, though with regard to the language the controversy is not conclusively settled.

Students of Celtic literature,—and in general, students of popular epics and romances,—will find in these ethnological chapters a good many valuable comments on the old Welsh and Irish saga texts. From this point of view the remarks on possible survivals of matriarchy,—the succession of sister's sons to a title, metronymic designations, and the like,—are of especial interest. The authors also have some things to say about

the literary relations between Wales and Ireland in the earliest periods. They take issue with the opinion expressed by Dr. Kuno Meyer (in the *Transactions* of the Society of Cymmrodorion, 1895-1896, pp. 71 ff.) that everything Goidelic in Britain is to be traced to invasions from Ireland, and they maintain on their side that much is to be attributed to the Goidelic settlers who preceded the Brythonic tribes in Britain and who, in their opinion, were never expelled or exterminated. It is obvious that this is a problem of literary history as well as of ethnology. There is very little mention of Druidism in the book. In a brief reference to it (on page 83) the authors indicate their opinion that this system belonged particularly to the Goidelic rather than the Brythonic Celts, a theory from which bold inferences have been drawn by Mr. J. W. Willis Bund in his history of the *Celtic Church of Wales*.

The third chapter begins the more definitely historical portion of the book and recounts briefly the chief events during the Roman occupation of Britain. It gives some description of the colonial government and discusses the distribution of the different tribes on the island. Chapters IV., V. and VII. furnish a compact summary of Welsh history from the time of Cunedda till the conquest of the Principality by Edward I. There is very little detailed narrative and the authors announce at the outset that they "do not affect to write a history of Wales," a task which appears to them impossible with the materials at command. What they give is rather a scientific survey of the field with a sober criticism of the sources. Just this indication of the present state of knowledge is of great value at this time.

Chapter VI. gives a rather full account of the customs and institutions of the ancient Welsh. It is based on the collection of laws ascribed to Howel Dda, which the authors accept as being in substance an "authentic evidence of the condition of the Cymry in the tenth century." Chapter VIII. (on the legal and constitutional history) traces with some detail the successive steps in the organization of Wales under English rule. Chapter IX. deals with the history of land-tenure in Wales and is the work of Mr. Frederic Seebohm, who was associated with Messrs. Rhys and Jones in the Royal Commission.

The later chapters of the book are principally a description of modern Wales, its language, religions and educational systems, and the conditions of life that prevail among its people. A good deal of information not easily found elsewhere is here brought together.

Of especial interest to the comparative philologist is the appendix contributed by Professor J. Morris Jones of Bangor on "Pre-Aryan Syntax in Insular Celtic."

It is a pity that a number of bad misprints (on pages 25, 110, for example) should have been allowed to stand in a book of which the press-work is on the whole so attractive. In Table A (facing page 174) Llewelyn ab Gruffydd is twice printed for Gruffydd ab Llewelyn. An oversight of a different sort appears on page 53 where two lines are quoted from the Irish *Fled Bricrend*, though they really come from

another saga, the *Serglige Conculaind*. Mistakes like these are trivial, but they are sometimes annoying out of all proportion to their importance.

F. N. ROBINSON.

Calendar of Documents preserved in France, illustrative of the History of Great Britain and Ireland. Edited by J. HORACE ROUND, M.A. Vol. I., A.D. 918-1206. (London: Printed for her Majesty's Stationery Office, by Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1899. Pp. lv, 680.)

HOWEVER much scholars may have been disposed to regret in the past the long delay in the publication of the transcripts of French charters, made two generations ago for the Public Record Office, everyone may now rejoice in the fact. It would have been difficult to find another English scholar so competent for this task as Mr. J. Horace Round who has now completed it. There may have been some as competent upon the side of diplomatic, or in special points more so, and some with as great a knowledge of the other sources of the period or of the history of the early families, but the combination in Mr. Round's case has never been rivalled. One has only to glance through these pages to learn how much we owe to the editor's pains and knowledge. Not merely has the number of the charters been largely increased, over the original transcript, but there are frequent corrections of the text both in the body of the charters and in the lists of witnesses, some of them of great importance. The labor spent upon this work, which only those can estimate who are familiar with its demands, must have been enormous.

The first question which one asks about such a work is naturally: how has the calendaring been done? Can we depend upon it to give us the really important points so that we may use it with confidence, when the original is inaccessible? I am sure that no one who has read many charters can read more than two or three of the important ones of this book without saying to himself: Of the most essential parts, this is not a calendar at all; it is a translation. Comparison with the full text of such of the charters as are to be had in print shows this to be actually the case. Two other points are to be noticed. In the body of the charters, throughout the book, the original words are inserted in parenthesis where there may be any reasonable doubt about the rendering, or where there is any especial interest attaching to them, and the lists of witnesses are given in the original in every case. There is no need to call attention to the importance of these two matters.

If we compare this calendar with the latest work in the same line of the Germans, who have devoted so much attention to this method of publication, with the second edition of the Böhmer-Mühlbacher Carolingian *Regesten* for example, which bears the same date on the title-page, we feel no need of apologizing for the English work. There are many fewer references to printed texts of the charters, or to studies on them,

but this is because the texts and studies do not yet exist. The English calendar is not at all an itinerary nor an index to the chronicles or other sources, but this was not desired. In its bearing on the political or narrative history of the time, the English work is no better than the German and not so easy to use. As material for institutional history, however, it is decidedly superior. The German is hardly more than an index, and in the great majority of cases reference must be made to the full text, while in the case of the English in an equally large majority of cases this is not at all necessary. The point is stated in full, in fact the text is translated. To many of us on this side of the water, this is a matter of great importance. The American student, interested in Norman or feudal institutions, but stranded by some mysterious oversight of Providence far from a good library, has here, at a merely nominal cost as compared with printed cartularies, 1500 charters of these three centuries in a form to meet practically all his needs. He will find his reasons for gratitude increased by the addition to the careful index of names of an *index rerum*—not by any means complete even in the subjects that are noticed, but very welcome nevertheless.

It is probable that more that is strictly new may be learned from this book in family and local than in institutional history, but a great number of points of law and practice receive illustration, some of it by no means common. Most of the points which are new Mr. Round has noticed in his preface. One of the most interesting of these is the discovery in No. 1205 of the "sheriff of the honor of Pevensey." Mr. Round does not make it clear in his remarks whether he supposes the Walter of this charter to have been a king's sheriff, or the Count of Mortain's own *vicomte* for the honor, but as one charter clearly shows that the count recovered possession of the land which Walter had seized by a suit in his own court he probably means the latter. If this interpretation of the case is correct, we have here the best illustration yet found of what is a very rare use of the word in England, and one much less common in Normandy itself than in some other parts of France. Charter No. 757 of the *Gloucester Cartulary* (Vol. II., p. 197) may be compared with No. 1122 of Mr. Round's *Calendar*. These instances do not prove that the grantors actually had officers whom they called *vicomtes*, but they do show that such a use of the word was not strange to them.

The feudal court, whether royal or baronial, receives in these charters constant illustrations on all sides, of composition, procedure, and competence. Interesting instances are: the oral examination of witnesses before the court in Nos. 78 and 1190, but there is here no case so interesting as that recorded in Boutaric, *Actes du Parlement de Paris*, I. ccxcviii, No. 4; the election or appointment of a committee of the court to go apart to consider the case and decide it in Nos. 712, 1114, and 1257, a very old practice; the trial of appeals to the Pope by local ecclesiastics appointed by him from whose decision there was no appeal, Nos. 143-147; suits of the lord in his own court, Nos. 232, 799, 1205;

an ecclesiastical suit before a secular tribunal "according to the custom of Normandy," No. 1257, but the cartulary of La Couture, No. XVI., records a suit between the same parties before an ecclesiastical tribunal. These cases are mentioned only as illustrations. Almost a complete statement of the judicial usages of feudalism could be made from this volume.

The *Calendar* gives us renewed and conclusive evidence of the close similarity, in fact of the identity, of all the arrangements here coming to notice, public and private, on the two sides of the channel. There was no doubt a real sense in which the two governments were distinct, but there were ways in which they were constantly running together. There seems to have been no difference between *curia regis* and *curia ducis*, and officers from one country serve without comment in the other. In fact the classes that move and act in these charters, nobles and ecclesiastics, seem to regard the two countries, for all practical purposes, as one land.

GEORGE BURTON ADAMS.

The Venetian Republic: Its Rise, its Growth, and its Fall, 421-1797. By W. CAREW HAZLITT. (London: Adam and Charles Black; New York: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Two vols., pp. xxvii, 814, xi, 815.)

THIS is the third and final edition of the work which Mr. Hazlitt first published as a sketch in 1858, and republished, much expanded, in 1860. It would almost be proper to call it a new work, since one of its volumes contains quite as much matter as all the four volumes of 1860 contained, and, while much of the substance of the earlier edition reappears here, it has been greatly modified. The history now ends not with the tragedy of the Foscari, but with the extinction of the Republic in 1797. Thus the narrative, instead of breaking off arbitrarily in the middle of the fifteenth century, is complete, allowing the reader to contemplate that last impressive period in the life of Venice—the period of unparalleled magnificence behind which lurked unsuspected ruin.

A captious critic might easily point out that a work produced by successive accretions cannot have that unity and symmetry which belong to the highest works of art—whether they be histories, paintings or poems—giving them the effect of having been created by a single swift, masterful stroke; even when we know, as in the case of *The Divine Comedy*, that the act of creation extended over many years. More serious than this defect, especially in a history, would be the evidence that the author had not kept up with the unearthing of new material, which, in what relates to Venice, has been both bulky and important during the past forty years. So far as the present reviewer has observed, however, Mr. Hazlitt has not slighted the new stores of material, although he has probably set a different value on some of them from what he would have done had he begun to write in 1890 instead of in 1857. Comparing the edition of

1860 with this last, one finds changes not only in form but also in substance, indicating that the work has been remoulded, and not merely revised. There has been a gain too in style, due chiefly to the greater compression which Mr. Hazlitt has learned to practise. He is still too diffuse in places, still overfond of giving free rein to a natural propensity for digressing; but even this fulness has its advantage, when it leads him, for instance, to print entire the last speeches of Doge Tommaso Mocenigo (I. 800-806).

But in a notice as brief as the present, it is impossible to criticize details without creating a false impression as to the worth of the work as a whole. Of this, there should be no doubt. Mr. Hazlitt has written not only the best history of Venice in English, but he has excelled any histories in Italian, French, or German that compete with him. On special periods, or topics, several other historians have written authoritatively, but it is somewhat singular that the whole field should have been so long neglected. Daru, the "regulation" historian of Venice before Hazlitt, wrote too early to have access to indispensable material. Mr. Horatio F. Brown, the only other recent English writer, contented himself with a sketch, admirable in many respects, but still only a sketch. Whoever reads Hazlitt may rest assured, therefore, that he has before him the best history of Venice, whatever may be its limitations, now in existence.

As a supplement to the history itself, Mr. Hazlitt has added twenty-five chapters, equal to more than a fourth of the whole work, on the manners, customs, topography, government, police, church, commerce, laws, coinage, dwellings, education, drama, literature, and charitable institutions of Venice. Such an encyclopaedia of information cannot be found elsewhere in a single book; had it been printed separately, it would have sufficed to establish a permanent reputation for its author. He has overlooked no detail, however minute, and as he arranges his material chronologically, one follows the development of a custom, or of an institution, from its origin to its ending, in the most instructive way. Needless to say, the view we thus get of the Venetians in their daily life enables us the better to understand their history; and, finally, it is unflaggingly entertaining. Nobody can close this history without acknowledging that Mr. Hazlitt has succeeded in his purpose of telling the truth about Venice and the Venetians. By so doing, he dispels the old notion that they were a people delighting in dark crimes. He shows how, on the contrary, they led Europe for many centuries in the essentials for civilization, not less than in trade and wealth. Out of their character there grew up one of the most interesting forms of government the world has seen—an oligarchy, which not only inspired the most fervent devotion of the masses whom it was supposed to oppress, but which also, unlike all other oligarchies, was long-lived. Mr. Hazlitt's monumental work ought to draw attention anew to the constitution of that state which, though sea-born, and cradled in the shifting mud of the lagoons, proved more durable than any other in history. Before the Roman Empire fell,

the fighting Veneti had set up their infant republic ; George Washington had just ceased to be President of the United States, when that Republic was extinguished : between these two events there stretches more than thirteen hundred years of Venetian history.

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

Serfs et Villains au Moyen Age. Par HENRI DONIOL. (Paris : Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1900. Pp. vi, 299.)

The End of Villainage in England. By THOMAS WALKER PAGE, Ph.D. (New York : The Macmillan Co. Published for the American Economic Association. 1900. Pp. 99.)

ALONG with the many new works that have been produced recently as a result of the deeper interest that has grown up in the condition of the mass of the people in past times, appears this work by M. Doniol enunciating his views on medieval servitude and its disappearance. It is professedly but a restatement of conclusions reached and published more than forty years ago in his *Histoire des Classes Rurales en France*. Indeed it bears only too clearly the marks of the historical work of that period. Few specific references are given for his statements. Indeed he deprecates exclusive reliance upon authorities, and repeatedly enforces the claims of the "probability of things," "induction based upon probability," and "universal acceptance." His practice follows this theory. For example he says : "If we go back in thought to the tribe we can see quite evidently how the different modes of subjection established themselves ;" and then proceeds to draw a picture, quite fanciful so far as any records of the past show, of the origination of two forms of servitude. For better or for worse, methods of historical investigation and exposition have changed greatly during the half-century between M. Doniol's earlier and later work.

But even undeveloped methods in the hands of a master may produce results of the greatest importance, and M. Doniol is one of the greatest of French historians. Such a statement of his conclusions as this cannot therefore be without interest and value. His book is practically a study of the distinction between villains and serfs in medieval France, and of the enfranchisement of the latter class. He draws the clearest line of distinction between the two classes. Villains were free, serfs not free. The villain was a subject to be taxed, the serf an article of possession. Villainage was the result of the possession of political rights by feudal lords, serfdom of their possession of lands to be worked. Villains were the subjects of the lordship, serfs its servants.

M. Doniol devotes the greater part of his work to a description of the position of these two classes, respectively. The serfs he treats as a comparatively homogeneous body. The class of villains is defined much more widely, including persons described by many different names in the documents, and possessing many different characteristics. Even the townsman, the merchant, and the handicraftsman of the early Middle Ages appear in this category.

The most instructive and original portion of M. Doniol's work, however, lies in the chapters which trace the emancipation of the serf. According to his statements emancipation became active about the middle of the thirteenth century and was practically completed within two hundred years. Liberty was offered by lords to their serfs before it was asked for by them. Enfranchisement was granted by the king to the serfs on his domains earlier than by any private lords on theirs.

This was because the king wanted taxable subjects more than he wanted laborers. The town corporations were the next to emancipate their serfs, the noblemen followed; the ecclesiastical corporations were the last. Notwithstanding the vast number of written charters of emancipation, the greater part of the work of enfranchisement was done by tacit agreement. Emancipation was a purely local change differing in time and character in different provinces; Normandy being the earliest to free itself from serfdom, Burgundy the last. Among the various reasons for difference of period of enfranchisement in different localities the character of the soil was the most important. For a century or more the serfs had no great desire to be freed, then freedom became attractive to them and their desires and those of the lord's corresponded, so that servitude rapidly became exceptional.

This is all extremely suggestive and interesting, and it may be true,—indeed much of it undoubtedly is, but M. Doniol has neither proved it nor given us the necessary means of proving or disproving it. One cannot get rid of a feeling of doubt and uncertainty. May not his fundamental distinction between serfs and villains be an arbitrary or imaginary one? That distinction did not exist in any positive institutional sense across the Channel. Indeed M. Doniol's own reservations in the course of discussion make the distinction very tenuous indeed in medieval France.

Mr. Page's work, in contrast with that just described, is a study of entirely new material, most of it never read by any previous student, much less utilized for historical purposes. His statements moreover are always fortified by direct references and his generalizations supported by a sufficient number of recorded facts. His pamphlet is threefold in subject, giving first a description of the institution of villainage as it existed in the thirteenth century; second, disproof of any considerable change in that institution before the middle of the fourteenth century; and lastly, an analysis of the course of change from that time forward until villainage had become a thing of the past by the close of the fifteenth century.

The first section is of inferior importance, having become by this time a matter of commonplace knowledge. In the other two divisions of his subject Mr. Page has fulfilled three tasks of a negative character which immediately attract attention. He shows, in opposition to the statements of Professor Rogers, that there had been but little commutation of labor services for money payments before 1350. He has examined records dated between 1325 and 1350 of eighty-one manors, and finds in more than half of them practically no commutation and in but six complete commutation of praedial services. Similarly Professor Rogers's suggestion that

has been so widely accepted, that a return to labor services was enforced by the lords upon the villain tenants after the Black Death is shown to be a mistake, for the records of one hundred and twenty-six manors within the thirty years following the pestilence show no single instance of such an increase or return, but quite the contrary process. Thirdly, the distinction between serfs and villains, between tenure in bondage and tenure in villainage, is shown to have had no existence in the usage of manorial courts or in other manorial records, the only place where such a distinction could have had any importance if it had existed. Villains, *nativi*, customary tenants, and persons described by several other terms were undifferentiated except in the discussions of some medieval and modern lawyers. The change of labor services into money payments progressed with great rapidity after the pestilence of 1348-1349 and this was tantamount to the cessation of villainage as a form of tenure. Regular money payments had not that character of uncertainty which kept the villain subject to the manorial bailiff, excluded him from the king's courts, and kept his tenure like his personal status, servile. Mr. Page carefully distinguishes villain status from villain tenure, and treats their disappearance as two separate though dependent movements. But the first is more satisfactorily done than the second. He notices the leasing out of the demesne as progressing coincidently with the process of commutation, but does not repeat the valuable statistics on this point given in his pamphlet, *Die Umwandlung der Frohndienste*. But does he not miss here perhaps the most important incentive to the non-enforcement of the disabilities of villains? It was not that commutation made villainage of less interest to the lords because they could not now get labor for the demesne if they wanted to, but that by the leasing of their demesnes they did not any longer want a labor supply even if they could have obtained it.

Mr. Page makes a mistake in stating that enfranchisement came later in France than in England, as M. Doniol's book shows. But this is one of very few slips. In the matter of which his book is a special study he shows the firmness of touch, the clearness of views and the originality of interpretation which can only come from much close contact with the sources from which all our knowledge must be drawn.

E. P. CHEYNEY.

Luther and the German Reformation. By THOMAS M. LINDSAY, D.D., Professor of Church History, Free Church College, Glasgow. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. xii, 300.)

THE new series of small and handy volumes entitled "The World's Epoch-Makers" opens well. The editor seems to have placed the successive topics for discussion in competent hands. Certainly Dr. Lindsay is a successful and enthusiastic student of his particular theme. Of this he gave proof in a remarkable paper read before "the Alliance of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System" at its fifth gen-

eral Council held in Toronto, in September, 1892. This paper which he entitled "The Protestant Reformation: its Spiritual Character and its Fruits in the Individual Life," clearly indicated the standpoint from which by preference he views the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Between the ground there taken and that of his later volume there is possibly a shade of difference. In the former he appears to regard the religious as the only correct interpretation of the great movement in question. "It is impossible," he there writes, "to state all the various ways in which men have misread the Reformation, but for the sake of showing its intrinsic spiritual character let me refer to three, which may be called the political, the intellectual, and the social." In his book, on the other hand, while retaining in great measure the phraseology of his earlier essay, he admits that other views may in themselves be correct; that, for example, the movement may be treated as an intellectual movement with Erasmus then as its central figure, and "studied but scarcely explained from this point of view." Essentially, however, there is no change; and the position is assumed, and correctly assumed, in our opinion, that "when Luther is taken as the central figure, one—the religious—must dominate all the other points of view, and the various intricate intermingled movements must be regarded as the environment of this one central impulse."

It is not necessary to say more in this connection than that Dr. Lindsay has carried out his thought consistently, forcibly and in a genuine scholarly fashion. The style is fresh and animated. The book is as remote as possible from being heavy reading. It avoids unnecessary minutiae, makes no pretense of being exhaustive, and contains few or no marginal notes. Intended for general readers, it naturally avoids any display of authorities, although it is evidently built upon a firm foundation of solid scholarship studiously hidden away from view. The interest is the greater from the fact that the author, as he tells us, has striven to show that "although Luther's life has been written scores of times there still is room for another,—for one which will be careful to set Luther in the environment of the common social life of his time." Dr. Lindsay does indeed take the pains to disclaim the pretension that his book is even a sketch of the reformer's life written in this way. But no reader, especially of the chapters treating of Luther's more intimate life, will deny him the credit of having achieved success in this direction.

HENRY M. BAIRD.

The Silver Map of the World; A Geographical Essay, including some Critical Remarks on the Zeno Narrative and Chart of 1558 and on the Curious Misconception as to the Position of the Discoveries made by Frobisher. By MILLER CHRISTY. (London: Henry Stevens, Son and Stiles. 1900. Pp. xii, 71, 10 maps.)

THE problem of geographical discovery, and of every other kind of discovery, never was and never can be the adjustment of a newly dis-

covered thing to its relation with what succeeding generations may find to be the truth. The man who finds out something about which he knew nothing, be he scientist, scholar, or merely a sailing-master, does not try to guess what those who come after him will know about it; if he is wise he will rest content with the effort to fit the new thing into its proper place in relation to what is already known. When Martin Frobisher sailed between two headlands in a part of the world where no one so far as he knew had ever been before, he did not try to construct the prospective Admiralty chart of Davis Strait. He took the best maps of the world available when he sailed from England, and, because he was a man who had done things which taught him the probable values of contemporary cartographic evidence, the additions which he made to those maps were a surprisingly close approximation to what is now known to be the actual lay of the land and water in the northwestern Atlantic. If the home-keeping students who appropriated the result of his voyages and made them a part of the general stock of European information had been content to read Frobisher's data carefully, as it was represented on the maps drawn by men who worked under his immediate influence, geographical progress would have been spared the delay of two centuries of mistaken notion regarding the coast line of southern Greenland. Mr. Miller Christy, in his essay on "The Silver Map of Drake's Voyage," shows some of the ways in which this misconception arose and what its results have been. The story is an instructive lesson for every student who feels a call to explain and elucidate the apparent errors of his predecessors.

Mr. Christy's work is in many respects one of the most suggestive of recent essays in geographical history. His subject is a silver medallion, commemorative of Drake's circumnavigation voyage of 1577-1580, which was probably designed by the same "F. G." who signed the exquisite and engraved map issued with Hakluyt's edition of Peter Martyr's *De Orbe Novo* in 1587. The medallion, which has hitherto been virtually unknown to students of cartography, shows a tracing of Drake's route, with the names of the more important places visited during the first English voyage around the world. Besides a photographic facsimile of the medallion, Mr. Christy illustrates his arguments with a number of contemporary maps, two of which have not been before available to students outside of London. One is an extremely interesting sailing chart prepared by William Borough, which appears to have been used by Frobisher in charting his discoveries during the voyage of 1576. The other is a projection, drawn by Mr. J. W. Addison, reproducing for the first time the North Atlantic configuration on the Molineux Globe in the Middle Temple, London. Aside from the maps, Mr. Christy's essay is especially useful as an illustration of the importance of considering contemporary events in their mutual relations. Francis Drake we commonly think of as a freebooter and circumnavigator; Frobisher was a searcher for the northwest passage and the gold mines thereabout; Zeno the younger was or was not a prince of impos-

tors. As Mr. Christy shows, the work of these men was intimately connected, and the significance of what each did cannot be understood without a careful appreciation of what the others were doing. Altogether, Mr. Christy has produced a thoroughly useful volume which is quite indispensable to any one who wishes to study the course of English American maritime history during the later years of the sixteenth century.

GEORGE PARKER WINSHIP.

English Political Philosophy from Hobbes to Maine. By WILLIAM GRAHAM, M.A. (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1900. Pp. xxx, 415.)

THE problems of political philosophy belong in one aspect to philosophy, in another to jurisprudence, in another to history, and in yet another to the work of the publicist and reformer. The six authors, Hobbes, Locke, Burke, Bentham, Mill and Maine, whom Professor Graham has selected for treatment, well exemplify this variety of interests. Such a series must lend itself to quite different modes of treatment, according to the standpoint of the critic. Professor Graham, who occupies the chair of jurisprudence and political economy at Queens College, Belfast, is naturally most at home in the historical and jurisprudential rather than in the philosophical aspect of his subject, but he enters with zest into discussions of natural rights and natural law, utilitarianism and intuitionism, from an ethical as well as from a legal or political point of view.

The introduction to the work raises the question of method. Hobbes, Locke, and Bentham, it is stated, exemplify the deductive method, Maine the historical. Burke occupies a somewhat wavering position, employing the deductive method, but upon principles obtained either from experience or from history, whereas Hobbes and Locke start from an assumed state of nature and social contract. Bentham employs also the analytical method, which proceeds by analyzing and defining the leading conceptions, such as sovereignty. Mill, though advocating what he calls the inverse deductive method, which would verify historical inductions by psychological deductions, really relies chiefly on the deductive method. The author for his own part believes that the deductive method, temporarily eclipsed by Bentham's Theory of Legislation and next by the historical method, may be applied legitimately in reasoning "from our instinctive principles of justice." He holds that we may "attain to an *a priori* science of natural law or rights, and use and apply its principles deductively to new cases, as is certainly still done in courts of justice by our ablest judges." The question at once arises whether the conception of justice is not undergoing ceaseless transformation with the progress of civilization, and if so whether its ablest expositors really go back to "instinctive intuitions." In so far as there is moral progress this is found not in the instinctive aspect of our moral judgments—this instinctive

aspect stands for the factor of habit—but in the formation of new moral ideals, and this is the work not of instinct but of critical thought and constructive imagination. To make the methodology of the subject complete, mention should be made of the method which Kant attempted to introduce into all fields of philosophy—viz. the critical. Instead of deducing the logical consequences from certain supposititious primitive conditions, or laws of nature, or definitions of sovereignty, this begins at the other end, analyzes the existing political organism and discovers the principles which must be postulated if sovereignty and freedom, justice and progress, are to be accounted for.

The body of the work comprises an account of the leading political doctrines of the six authors named above, accompanied by criticism upon their logic and their statements of facts, or predictions as to the future. The accounts of the theories of the various writers are well done. Such a comprehensive abstract is especially valuable in the case of Burke, whose doctrines are scattered through many essays, and mixed with much rhetorical material, or in the case of Mill and Maine, whose various writings need to be compared.

As to the criticisms, those on Hobbes and Locke have less field for originality, as the defects of those writers have been frequently pointed out. Burke's misreading of the past and gloomy predictions as to the future are corrected. Bentham's work as a legislative reformer is praised, though his ethical theory is condemned as unpractical and illogical. With Mill's spirit, the author has much in sympathy, though he is more conservative than Mill on questions of property and woman's suffrage. He claims, and rightly, I think, that Mill's comparative failure was due to his lack in the intuitive vision, in the creative insight and speculative boldness which mark the work of a Hobbes or Rousseau. He might have added that Mill labored all his life under the burden of an intellectual heredity of atomistic psychology and mechanical philosophy from which he only partially worked free. Maine's historical method is recognized as highly important, but the author would supplement it as noted above, in the discussion of methods, and his judgments upon the working of democracy are much more favorable than those of Maine.

A word seems necessary as to the philosophical side of Professor Graham's treatment, inasmuch as this has considerable prominence. It was of course not obligatory upon the author to select any writer of the school of Green, Ritchie, and Bosanquet for exposition, but it seems strange that he has not profited by their work. He is conscious of the inadequacy of utilitarianism, and feels that a truth underlies the principle of natural rights, but he lacks the psychological analysis for stating this underlying truth in a tenable form. He falls back on "instincts," "sense" of justice, "implanted feelings" (pp. 236 ff., 382 ff.), without appreciating the difficulty that the mere presence of certain feelings is hardly a sufficient answer to the further question, whether these feelings should be made dominant or should be controlled or even suppressed in the interests of other feelings and instincts. He argues for law of

nature without noticing the ambiguities so clearly pointed out by Ritchie in the term "nature." He opposes intuitionism to utilitarianism without considering a third possibility, and similarly he opposes natural law to utilitarianism without giving any serious attention to the conception of a common will. He does not notice the implications of modern social psychology, which shows that the individual is a social outcome rather than a social unit, and that hence by virtue of his very dependence upon the social and political organism for freedom, rights, and development, he is bound to act as a member of this organism. This philosophical inadequacy, however, by no means interferes with the value of the work from other standpoints. For its able summaries, and its candid and judicious comments certainly make it a useful and welcome treatise.

JAMES H. TUFTS.

Histoire des Rapports de l'Église et de l'État en France de 1789 à 1870. Par A. DEBIDOUR. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1898. Pp. ii, 740.)

THIS large and elaborate history of the relations of Church and State in France during nearly a century, is the most valuable contribution to modern church history that has appeared for some time. The subject itself is of great importance and interest, comprising the whole story of the Church during the French Revolution, the settlement by Napoleon, and the resulting history down to the fall of the Second Empire. It involves the fundamental principles of ecclesiastical policy and innumerable interesting problems.

One of the most striking features of the book is the charming style in which it is written. One may read page after page of these long and solidly printed pages, not only without the slightest weariness, but with increasing interest and delight. The keen analyses, impartial judgments, broad views and critical scholarship find expression in a style which for grace and rhythm is rarely found in historical prose.

In his preface, the author, well known to readers of modern French history, declares that he has no thesis to maintain nor any special plea to present, but he does believe that a clear historical narrative will bring out two fundamental principles equally precious; freedom of worship and the sovereignty of the state. "The State," he says, "has no right to proscribe or fetter a religion which does not disturb public order nor has it any right to legislate in spiritual matters. But no religion ought, in my opinion, to encroach on the domain of civil society, and if, in consequence of such abuse, a conflict should arise between the two powers, the last word ought always to belong to the State."

The book opens with an extremely helpful and suggestive résumé of the relations of Church and State in the old régime, especially considering the Reformation settlement and its results in France down to the breaking out of the Revolution of 1789. The body of the work is divided into two parts: the first part, entitled "Revolution," dealing

with the history to the fall of Napoleon; the second, entitled "Reaction," continuing the history from 1814 to 1870. A "Conclusion" summarizes briefly but clearly the whole course of the history, noting the general principles involved and the most striking problems presented. An appendix furnishes an exceedingly valuable collection of documents comprising over a score of statutes, ordinances, decrees and encyclicals, those issued in Latin being given in a French translation. The work is copiously supplied with foot-notes, each chapter begins with a comprehensive bibliography of authorities, and an analytical table of contents completes the volume.

To give even the briefest sketch of the course of the history would require too much space, but certain points of special interest should not be left unnoticed.

The ecclesiastical problem which faced the nation in 1789 could be solved in only three ways: 1, Separation of Church and State; 2, A new Concordat, following that of 1516; 3, A state law imposed upon the Church by the civil authority. This last our author says rightly was the only course morally possible. Indeed it may be said fairly that those who condemn outright the Revolution settlement show themselves profoundly ignorant of the historical conditions. This settlement found its completion in the Concordat of 1801, recognizing the Roman Catholic religion as that of the great majority of French citizens, and allowing its free public exercise in conformity with the regulations of police.

M. Debidour explains the delay in the publication of the Concordat from July, 1801, when it was signed, until April, 1802, that Napoleon might join with it the Organic Articles which practically reasserted the Gallican liberties. If these had been revealed immediately after the signing of the Concordat, the Pope might have hindered him from carrying them out by retarding indefinitely, as far as it depended on him, the execution of the treaty. The court of Rome did protest, in vain however, against the Organic Articles, regarding which it had not been consulted and which Napoleon presented as inseparable from the Concordat. Here however Napoleon committed the error to which all victors are liable, that of pressing their victims too far and thus losing the fruits of their own victory. The Church in France was overwhelmed apparently by the civil power. The tendency therefore, for relief, was to turn to the Pope with a submission more docile and less independent than in the old régime. It is going too far, however, to say in the words which conclude the chapter: "The old régime made the clergy of France Gallican, Napoleon made it ultramontane." As I have said elsewhere,¹ "We might as well ask if the Concordat brought about ultramontanism everywhere. The Vatican Council of 1870 was not the council of French bishops alone; indeed there was quite as pronounced opposition to its decrees by the French clergy as by those of any other country in Europe." Ultramontanism was the next step in the papal policy; it was due to the restoration of the Jesuits, the abrogation of Napoleon's Concordat and

¹ *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1895*, p. 483.

the Organic Articles, and the substitution of a new Concordat in 1817, practically though not by legislation.

A careful review of the succeeding history in France shows the increasing friction between the two powers, the opposition of the Church becoming ever more dangerous to the state. The Church gained steadily a large part of the ground which it lost at the time of the Revolution. That it did not gain more is due to the growth of the modern spirit of democracy, the development of the common people forming the great middle class, free and sovereign. Grateful to the Revolution for what it had gained, the people suspected that party which so long checked the legitimate development of this great movement and retarded for nearly a century the definite establishment of the Republic. Since the establishment of the Republic, it is true that the clergy under the direction of a shrewd and politic Pope have changed somewhat their attitude toward the established government.

What the results will be it is too early to predict. Will they become reconciled once for all? Will they make mutual concession? Will one submit to the law of the other? Will they begin anew the strife? Will they enter into a complete separation? We know not and no one else knows.

CHARLES L. WELLS.

Die Kolonialpolitik Napoleons I. By GUSTAV ROLOFF. [Historische Bibliothek. Band X.] (Munich and Leipzig: R. Oldenbourg. 1899. Pp. xiv, 258.)

IN the course of those repeated and almost frantic efforts to destroy the Napoleon legend which have been continuous in France since 1870 much wholesome truth has been widely disseminated, but with it some pernicious error. The men of Lanfrey's school pose like their leader as dispassionate seekers after truth, as stern devotees of historical science. But their bitter partisanship is easily discoverable by any who care to follow them in the course of their researches. Among other calumnies which he and they have circulated is the statement that Napoleon neither understood nor was interested in colonial affairs. This is a most remarkable charge, for any investigator may disprove it by means of the officially selected and published correspondence of Napoleon, volumes which stand on the shelves of any good library. But those who go further will be even more amazed by such effrontery. The author of this meritorious volume has examined the archives of the Navy Department in France and gives in his pages abundant proof that Napoleon's care for the colonies of France was intelligent, painstaking and assiduous. For reasons unknown to him the archives of the Foreign Office were not put at his disposal. But others have been permitted freely to search them, and they too furnish abundant evidence to the same effect.

This volume was needed. Everyone knows that the French lost their colonies in the Napoleonic epoch: most suppose that the loss was due to the Emperor's neglect. Dr. Roloff proves how utterly false this supposition is. He gives a succinct and readable narrative of the facts, he sup-

ports his statements by sufficient proof, and he shows satisfactorily how the central stream of European history was now and then affected by Napoleon's lavish expenditure of men and money at the ends of the earth. When the Directory fell, the French colonial empire, once so splendid, was no more. French rule had disappeared from India, Senegal and most of the Antilles; San Domingo was wrecked and virtually independent; mismanagement and speculation had almost ruined Guadeloupe, Réunion and the Ile de France; there was but one remaining possession, Guyana, where French authority was paramount. The French merchant marine had disappeared from the seas and the traffic of what were still called French colonies was conducted by traders from the United States.

Napoleon's Egyptian expedition, his Mediterranean policy in general, so ably sketched by Albert Vandal, the Herculean efforts he put forth to rescue San Domingo and the course of events in the Antilles: all these our author examines in the light of Napoleon's efforts to restore French control where but lately it had been complete. Further, he holds up the acquisition of Louisiana, and the reorganization of the colonies between the negotiation and breach of the treaty of Amiens as conclusive evidence that Napoleon had formed and was carefully working out a comprehensive plan. Incidentally a matter of vital historical importance is discussed, namely Napoleon's confidence in the solidity of his peace, as shown by his exertions for the colonies without reference to upbuilding a sea-power adequate for their defence, or a system of coast and harbor fortifications which would make them impregnable. This certainly does not point to a secret determination on Napoleon's part to bring on the wars which so long devastated western and central Europe.

Further we have a somewhat inadequate account of the social and economic conditions of the Antilles and of Decaen's interesting expedition to India. Between Austerlitz and Erfurt it became clear that in the complications of affairs in Europe France could not hope either for mastery at sea or for a marine peace. But even then Napoleon's activity was prodigious. He covered a new plan of colonial policy comprehending the Balkan peninsula, the shores of the Mediterranean, and the annexation of Spain with all the Spanish colonies to his system. It is a serious fault that the volume under review does not sufficiently discuss this last point nor recount the French efforts in Argentina. We are utterly at variance with the author in the scant note he gives on page 242. The effect of Trafalgar was to emphasize a fact already patent, the weakness of the French navy. But thereafter not even the slightest diminution of effort for colonial expansion is noticeable. What man could do was done. Even when England seized the last remnants of French colonial empire in the east, Réunion and the Ile de France, Napoleon was undismayed. Spain was intractable but Holland was not: when the latter country became a satellite kingdom of the French empire her splendid colonies likewise entered the French system. Fairly assured of continental peace Napoleon at once turned his attention to his colonies old and new. In May, 1811, an expedition of two frigates and a cor-

vette, with fourteen hundred troops and ample supplies, reached Java in safety. A similar one of equal or greater strength destined for the Ile de France was destroyed by the British about the same time. Six months later the British seized Java ; but this fact does not disprove Napoleon's care or concern.

The central truth then is clear : that Napoleon did have a colonial policy comparable to the other great plans which he formed, that he put forth every exertion to carry it out, studying his problems, sparing neither time nor expense in solving them, and generally being deeply concerned to his latest hour with the inter-relations of world politics. It would indeed have been strange if a mind suckled on Raynal's *Two Indies* had belied its earliest manifestations of character and had been false to its whole training.

What then were the causes of Napoleon's colonial failure? The incapacity of Decrès, the minister of naval affairs, and of the naval administration generally, as the supporters of the Napoleonic legend declare? Certainly not ; mediocre as those men may have been the imperial spirit permeated naval administration as it permeated every other department of government. Dr. Roloff, we think, finds the true causes : first, in the necessary weakness of French sea-power due to intervals of peace so short that a navy could not be organized and built ; secondly, in the fact that European interests were more vital than colonial interests after all and that they must have Napoleon's main attention even though at times he jeopardized them for the sake of colonial empire.

We have already noted one grave fault in the discussion of a very important question : it seems ungracious to complain where so much is excellent. But we remark in closing that the authorities given, not as foot-notes, for the taste of readers in Germany as well as here is in revolt against them, but in the appendix, leave something to be desired. Doubtless the author's note-book would confirm every bald reference of "X to Y," date so and so, but in the use of unprinted sources where specific references are made at all the reader may fairly claim a few words of the original. These Dr. Roloff does not give ; yet he finds space for eleven pages of text, printing *in extenso* the instructions of the First Consul to Leclerc, a paper the contents of which at least were well known, even though the context was not. This we are glad he has done, but the other he might not have left undone. The writer's style is somewhat jejune but he avoids in the main those labyrinthine involutions which repel foreigners from the reading of German books. The idea of the essay is commendable ; so, too, on the whole, is the execution.

Preliminary Stages of the Peace of Amiens. By H. M. BOWMAN.
[University of Toronto Studies, History, Second Series, Vol. I., pp. 77-155.] (Toronto. The University Library. 1899. Pp. 79.)

MR. BOWMAN's dissertation is a good piece of work. It has endured the criticism of two famous universities, Leipsic and Toronto, and has

been accepted by them as admitting the writer to the guild of historians. It seems needless therefore to say that the materials of his work have been diligently collected from many sources, some of them archival and unpublished, and that he has mastered all of them thoroughly. The course of events and the consequent diplomacy which led up to the peace of Amiens will probably not be better outlined than in these pages until our knowledge is vastly expanded, and of that there is no immediate probability. Two characteristics of the pamphlet seem noteworthy: first, the confirmatory details drawn by the writer from unprinted material in the London Record Office; second, the rather startling confession of his concluding remarks, that it was Great Britain which deliberately broke the peace of Amiens and brought on the Napoleonic wars. Of the former the probable course of negotiations between Great Britain and Austria in 1800 (p. 46) is highly interesting, as indeed are some others. If the latter conclusion had been earlier accepted by the Tory historians of England, pounds of printers' ink and paper would have been saved for other than controversial purposes. Mr. Bowman clearly struggles to hold an even scale and keep himself open to conviction. Justification by the plea of necessity is, however, not always the refuge of ripe scholarship: it certainly does not close the debate. Trafalgar, Leipsic and Waterloo settled many things, but the question of moral responsibility was not among them.

We note one tendency which we consider dangerous. Known writers distinguished for logical exactness may sometimes state conclusions as facts; even they should be very chary in this practice, and others should not indulge in it at all. For example, and this is only one of many that might be quoted, it is a matter of opinion pure and simple what Bonaparte's relations were to the day of Fructidor (p. 14), and this should be stated. As to the perennial question of the invasion of England (p. 17) the reference is utterly misleading, for that was a notorious instance of the ever-recurring use by any and all French governments of such a menace in order to wring money from the public. The First Consul's direct appeal to George III. is represented on page 24 as a breach of English constitutional practice: we fancy the French executive was perfectly clear in his mind that the King of Great Britain ruled as well as reigned. Possibly our caution is not needed, for Mr. Bowman's readers will in the main be the wary ones of his own profession.

Henry Knox. A Soldier of the Revolution. By NOAH BROOKS.
(New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1900. Pp. xvi, 286.)

It is not often that an historical writer of to-day finds so unworked a mine of interesting and valuable biographical matter as Mr. Brooks has exploited in his life of Henry Knox, or one in which the veins of information are so easily accessible. A brief and rare sketch by Francis S. Drake, prepared for the "Memorials for the Massachusetts Society of the Cincinnati," has been hitherto the only, and a very unsatisfactory, memoir

of one of the most prominent and remarkable figures of the Revolution. The highest type of the volunteer general, a self-taught expert in the use of artillery, Washington's right-hand military man throughout all the battles from the siege of Boston to that of Yorktown, the founder of the Society of the Cincinnati, the second Secretary "at War," and one of the leading spirits in the development of what is now the state of Maine—surely so distinguished a patriot as this would long since seem entitled to a painstaking and accurate setting-forth of his character and attainments. This neglect is all the more remarkable in view of the accessibility of the material at Mr. Brooks's disposal. The fifty little-known massive volumes of the Knox Manuscripts, a rich storehouse of information, now in the library of the New England Historic-Genealogical Society, are in themselves almost a complete record of General Knox's life. In addition Mr. Brooks had the use of the Davis collection of Knox papers and the unfinished memoir of Joseph Willard of Boston.

In view of these facilities Mr. Brooks's volume is extremely disappointing. Instead of a scientific and exhaustive biography, we have one stamped with the earmark "popular," in which the copyist has played a large and striking part. Mr. Brooks has chosen to weave the career of General Knox into a brief history of the Revolution with the result of often subordinating his major theme and of adding much matter of little or no value to the reader desirous of getting a clear picture of the subject of the book. For instance, on page 68, the excuse for a description of the Bushnell torpedo is Mr. Brooks's opinion that this invention "doubtless engaged" General Knox's attention. There is no critical estimate of the worth of the General's military services and many important parts of his career such as his relationship to western military matters during his term as Secretary of War (1785-1794) are but insufficiently treated or ignored. While destined to find a place in many libraries, because of the absence of any other life of Knox, Mr. Brooks's narrative by no means says the last word on the subject and need deter no one from setting forth this interesting personality afresh. The book's poor index and its scanty reference to sources (there are none at all to the Knox manuscript volumes so copiously drawn from) will render it of still less value to the student.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD.

The Writings of James Monroe. Edited by STANISLAUS MURRAY HAMILTON. Vol. III., 1796-1802. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1900. Pp. xx, 457.)

THIS volume contains more that is new than either of its predecessors. Some of the letters, belonging to the year 1796, have been printed already, either in the *American State Papers* or in Monroe's *View* or in both; and Mr. Hamilton reprints in an appendix the text of the *View*. The rest of the letters are mostly fresh matter. Most of them come from the Monroe Papers, or those of Jefferson and Madison, in the possession

of the Department of State. A few are derived from the George Clinton Papers at Albany. A much larger number are taken from the executive letter-books in the office of the secretary of state of Virginia, being official letters of Monroe during his term of office as governor of that state, December 1799 to December 1802. The texts are in general good. We notice, p. 124, "Purriane's trip to London," for "Purviance's;" p. 134, "rush Mr. A. (Adams) to an explanation," for "push;" p. 160, "Carolina," for "Caroline" (County, Virginia); p. 192, "whether the common law is in form under the Federal Constitution," for "in force;" p. 354, "as" twice for "or." These are, under their respective circumstances, rather serious slips; but they are not numerous.

In the first part of the volume we have the last letters of Monroe to Secretary Pickering, and other papers relating to his first venture into the fields of diplomacy. To the present reviewer they seem to show slender abilities in diplomacy, and remarkable zeal in self-exculpation. Monroe was still highly self-conscious. Four years after his return, writing to one who had been his friend in Paris, he says (p. 265): "I can never look back on what occurred during a certain portion of my life without having my feelings peculiarly excited." The reader who hoped that the correspondence with Jefferson and Madison in the volume would cast interesting and important lights on the development of the Republican party in Virginia and the stirring events of 1798 will be disappointed. Throughout that year Monroe was still too full of his own grievances to pay much attention to those things. At the end of the next year he was elected governor of his native state, and half the present volume is devoted to the letters which he wrote while he held that office. The most interesting event of his three-years' term was the servile outbreak known as Gabriel's Insurrection, the history of which is fully illustrated by these pages. It caused a serious effort on the part of the Virginian legislature and executive toward mitigating the dangers arising from so numerous a negro population by deporting a part of the surplus, and especially the most dangerous portion. In accordance with a legislative resolution, application was made to the President of the United States, with a suggestion that western lands might be ceded for the purpose. This proving open to objections readily occurring to Mr. Jefferson, he suggested, among other expedients, arrangements with the British government for deportation to Sierra Leone. This correspondence, some of which has already been printed in Kennedy's *Report* on colonization, led indirectly, through the efforts of Gen. Charles Fenton Mercer in 1816, to the foundation of the American Colonization Society.

Other matters of interest are: letters respecting Callender, and Jefferson's relations to him; letters regarding the Virginian armory; a letter to Genet, written in 1800, in which Monroe says, "I considered it my duty not to injure your fame or detract from your merit while I was in France," etc.; and letters showing the anxiety of the executive of Virginia, and the precautionary measures taken by him, during the uncertainty as to the election of Jefferson at the federal capitol. That town,

by the way, is to Monroe, almost to the end of the period in question, "the federal town" or "the federal city." It is not till February 1801 that he can bring himself to call it the City of Washington. More than usual interest attaches to his annual communications to the Virginia legislature.

On the whole, the volume is not filled with remarkable things. It will not dissipate the impression that Monroe was a somewhat dull man; George Long, it will perhaps be remembered, thought him excessively so. And if a whole volume is devoted to this quiet period of his life, the number of volumes to which the whole series must extend will be much greater than was expected, unless subsequent and highly important periods are disposed of with disproportionate haste.

A History of the People of the United States, from the Revolution to the Civil War. BY JOHN BACH MCMASTER. Vol. V., 1821-1830. (New York: D. Appleton and Co. 1900. Pp. xiv, 577.)

THIS volume of Professor McMaster's masterpiece is in many respects unusually true to the peculiar promise of the title of the work. The period under inspection is that of Monroe's second term of office and of John Quincy Adams's administration with the introductory year of Jackson's reign. But, as in the preceding volume of the work the author has discussed the causes which led to the final rupture between the two wings of the Democratic-Republican party, he needs here to chronicle only the catastrophe. Out of fourteen chapters of the book before us, only six are devoted to the affairs of national politics and of the central administration. These six chapters are divided between the beginning and the end of the book and made to serve as covers to the body of the work, which is devoted to the consideration of sundry phases in the social and industrial evolution of the people of the United States. The first three chapters in the book contain, therefore, a summary of the important political and diplomatic events during Monroe's second term of office. In the first two chapters are presented the efforts for the suppression of the slave trade, the perilous controversies about the boundary in Texas and Oregon, and all the incidents and movements in Europe and South America which preceded and followed the declaration of the so-called Monroe Doctrine. The third chapter is entirely filled with the story of the presidential election of 1824, in the heat of which collision the crystallization of new parties began.

At the close of the book we find three more chapters in which the same subjects reappear, at the risk of some repetitions, which perhaps were inevitable after such an interval. Chapter LI. is devoted to the foreign policy of the Adams administration. It continues from Chapter XL. the discussion of our negotiations with England concerning the boundaries of Maine and Oregon and shows the unfriendly relations of the two countries over the West Indian trade. The statement of the varying phases of the boundary controversy during those years is admirably lucid,

and is illustrated by a map of Maine and the Maritime Provinces for the year 1830. The remainder of the chapter is filled with the story of the fiasco of the Panama Congress, showing all the threads of South American politics that were spun about that mortifying failure. The final paragraphs in Chapter XLI. about the support of the Latin-American republics against the Holy Alliance are substantially repeated (pp. 52-54, 438-440). The Central and South American republics would probably have secured the independence of both Cuba and Porto Rico at that time if our government had not feared to see the resultant establishment of a free negro population so near to our shores. It was due to slavery in the United States that Spanish misgovernment in the Antilles was endowed with a new lease of life. The slave power here bore to Spanish rule in America the same relation that Russia bears to Persia, at once its best friend and its worst foe, defending it against all attacks but its own. When slavery in the United States was overthrown, the Spanish authority in the Antilles was no less certainly doomed than that of the French in Mexico. It was interesting that the doom of the former should follow closely enough upon the heels of the latter to permit men who had been Confederate generals to become the agents of destiny. The author dismisses the magnificent visions and scanty realizations of the Adams administration with this view of foreign relations only, and passes on in Chapter LII. to the "bargain and corruption" cry against Adams and Clay which had already been partially examined in Chapter XLII. In the concluding chapter of the book (LIII.), the reader is introduced to the new heavens and new earth of Jackson's first administration, and the volume ends abruptly, in the midst of the mutterings of southern Democrats, in 1829, against the tariff.

Turning now to the eight chapters that compose the real substance of this volume, we pass at once from diplomatic conferences and congressional politics to a series of essays upon different aspects of the popular development during the generation prior to 1830. The author himself has provided a review of this part of his work in the following single sentence (p. 488), somewhat characteristically minute and unwontedly clumsy: "An attempt has been made to describe the life of the people in the cities, in the towns and villages, on the frontier; their ideas on government, on banking, on labor, on education, on literature, on the social problems of the time, have been reviewed; the astonishing betterment in the conditions of life brought about by new inventions and discoveries, new means of locomotion and the rise of new industries and new ways of gaining a livelihood, have all been described, and it is now time to turn, etc."

Under the topic "Socialistic and Labor Reforms" Professor McMaster groups together, first, a review of workingmen's parties in Philadelphia and New York City from 1791 to 1829; secondly, a description of the Owenite paradise at New Harmony, Indiana, where Robert Owen's enthusiastic disciple, William Maclure, awaited the time when he should see "foxes peering out of the windows of the crumbling buildings of

Philadelphia ;" thirdly, a lively sketch of the vagaries of Fanny Wright, and, finally, the origins of the anti-Masonic party in New York. The story of Morgan and anti-Masonry is out of place in such a chapter, for anti-Masonry was not socialistic or industrial in character. Anti-Masonry should find a place in the analysis of the political forces that made up the Adams or National Republican party, or in the story of the origins of the Whig party.

In a chapter entitled "The State of the Country from 1825 to 1829," the development of municipal government, trade and commerce is considered chiefly with reference to New York and Philadelphia, and then the story of coal-mines, canals, and pike-roads leads naturally to the ever interesting account of the social and industrial conditions in the Ohio and Mississippi valleys. The only defect in this sketch is its brevity. This making of a nation out of chaos is exactly what Professor McMaster started to depict and exactly what his readers want to see. He paints these pictures with a spirit that shows his powers of description at their best and fortunately he enjoys a ready sympathy for the abundant humors of the processes of social creation.

When John Reynolds held his first court among the people who were his old neighbors, the sheriff sat astride of a bench and opened court with the words, "Boys, the Court is now open. John is on the bench."

"Judge," said the foreman of a hung jury, "this is the difficulty: the jury want to know whether what you told us when we first went out really was the law, or whether it was only just your notion."

"On one occasion the treasurer of the State of Illinois, after a protracted struggle in the Legislature, failed of re-election. But the vote had scarcely been counted when he entered the chamber, took off his coat, and soundly thrashed, one by one, four men who had voted against him. Both friends and opponents considered this as no more than the occasion required, and he was promptly made Clerk of the Circuit Court."

In Chapter XLV. "The Negro Problem" introduces the American Colonization Society, founded in 1816, followed by the story of early abolition societies, the career of Benjamin Lundy and the enlistment of William Lloyd Garrison in the anti-slavery cause. Out of 101 anti-slavery societies existing in 1826, 77 were in the slaveholding border states. The fact that nearly 1000 Abolition votes were cast in the city of Baltimore, presumably chiefly by Quakers, explains why Lundy and Garrison chose to work in that city.

"The Industrial Revolution" is the name given to the history of the rise and triumph of protectionist sentiment in the tariffs of 1824 and 1828. Two chapters are assigned to the literary history of the period. One chapter is almost entirely filled with the diatribes against us that appeared in the English quarterly reviews from 1814 to 1828, surely a disproportionate allotment of space in Professor McMaster's work, even if the readers of those reviews did not make a similar complaint. Some of the jibes of the Britons are justified by the extraordinary announcement of a Boston contemporary of the Quarterly, called *The Emerald*.

Its editors hoped that it "would be polished by the labors of the learned, and occasionally glitter with the gayety of wit, and would be found worthy to shine among the gems which sparkle on the regalia of literature."

Another topic is "The Common School in the First Half-Century," an outline of history beginning with an act of the Massachusetts General Court in 1647, and then confining itself mainly to the development of schools in New York and Pennsylvania and to the land-grants and other efforts in behalf of education in the south and west.

"Political Ideas in the First Half-Century" is the subject of the last essay in the series. The crop of new state constitutions that sprang up in the path of the Jeffersonian revolution is examined with reference to the gradual disappearance of religious and property qualifications upon the suffrage. The historian does not, however, do justice to the close relation between these political notions and the religious and social contentions which embittered political feeling, especially in New England. Other prevalent ideas were the general reluctance to concede the right of courts to annul laws by declaring them unconstitutional, the widespread desire to define more clearly the limitations upon executive power, and the fear that the expansion of the country would involve it in ruin. When Louisiana, a territory outside the original boundary of the United States, was an applicant for admission to the Union (1812), Josiah Quincy voiced the apprehensions of New England in words that have a familiar sound: "You have no right to throw the liberties and property of this people into hotch-potch with the wild men on the Missouri, nor with the mixed though more respectable race of Anglo-Hispano-Gallo-Americans who bask on the sands at the mouth of the Mississippi. Do you suppose the people of the Northern and Atlantic States will or ought to look with patience and see representatives and senators from the Red River and Missouri pouring themselves on this and the other floor, managing the affairs of a seaboard 1500 miles at least from their residence?" Twenty New England members voted "No."

These somewhat disconnected studies, excellent as they all are, leave something to be desired in historical perspective as well as in symmetry of arrangement. In the review of events that contributed to popular progress there is no sacrifice of clearness or interest. The style is terse, the perception of the human interest is acute, the argument or narrative is straightforward, logical and accurate. And yet, sometimes, the author seems to lack that large firm grasp of relations which should unite the different parts of the story for a common purpose. The dramatic sense that is needed in order to make the whole story impressive is not often perceptible in these pages, and while the author may gain thereby in sanity he may lose somewhat in force. If he must give as much attention to political history as he seems to think, one might wish for a keener analysis of the political and social reactions that precipitated, out of the Jeffersonian elements, here an Adams party and there a Jackson party. There are signs that Professor McMaster is becoming more liberal in his

allowance for the influence that strong personalities exert upon the popular mind—of which they are at once the expression and the guide. He writes, as has already been observed, with especial attention to affairs in New York and Pennsylvania, and yet this volume, which covers the time of the final triumphs and vicissitudes of DeWitt Clinton, contains no adequate study of that once-potent leader, of his influence upon national politics, or of the political affiliations of his enthusiastic following. In fact the history of our people in their political life between 1824 and 1830 is little more than a study of the power of rival personalities, an unequaled group of contemporary leaders, Jackson, Van Buren, Crawford, Randolph, Clay, Adams, Clinton, Webster and Calhoun. It is still true that no one will turn to Professor McMaster's book in order to find an adequate estimate of the influence that these men exerted during this period among our people and upon the development of political ideas and parties. Perhaps, too, it would have been well to shorten some of the abstracts of magazine articles, pamphlets and Congressional debates and to enlarge more upon the extraordinary results of the temperance agitation which spread rapidly in New England after 1824.

This volume contains five maps. The most interesting is a reproduction of a map of Texas made in Cincinnati in 1836, which shows the territorial grants made by the Mexican government up to that time. On page 417, line 19, it is evident that some word has been omitted. The title-page now announces that the whole work will occupy seven, instead of six volumes, a welcome change, and it would seem that eight would be none too many, if the present rate of progress is retained. The development of the people during the decades 1830 to 1850 is a more fruitful topic than any that Professor McMaster has yet discussed, and it is to be hoped that he will not hurry over it.

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

Theodore Parker, Preacher and Reformer. By JOHN WHITE CHADWICK. (Boston and New York : Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1900. Pp. xx, 422.)

IN a notice of Weiss's *Life of Parker*, written for the *Atlantic Monthly* in 1864, I said that for the then existing generation Parker must be interpreted by one of the family—by one spiritually related to him, if not bound by the feebler tie of blood. While the accents of the great preacher yet lingered in the Boston Music Hall, he was no subject for complacent literary speculation or calm judicial discourse. More than the thirty years allotted to a generation have passed, and there reaches us a life of Parker by one spiritually related to him indeed, yet capable of a valuation of the man and his work that leaves little to be desired. This new life takes its place, not only as an admirable introduction to the fuller biographies of Weiss and Frothingham, but as a generally satisfactory estimate of what its subject was and was not—of his immense accomplishment and of the defects that limited his gigantic manhood.

Mr. Chadwick is aware how far from judicial were the occasional pulpit utterances of the preacher, how removed from charity were expressions printed in his private correspondence. No defence can be made of the description (in a letter to Dr. Francis) of certain Unitarian ministers—men of gracious and useful lives—in terms that might have been permitted to Savonarola in a characterization of Alexander VI. But the best of us write carelessly to friends who will sprinkle our hasty sentences with the proverbial grains of salt, and so we are ready to accept the biographer's kindly generalization that Parker "*thought in persons* and could with difficulty separate the opinion from the man." Yet every reader will not agree with Mr. Chadwick that the liberal ministers were wrong in desiring Parker's withdrawal from their body since it stood for free inquiry and free utterance. But how if this same free inquiry had led one of their associates to return to the worship of Minerva or to accept the inspired leadership of Joseph Smith? And the leap from the authority of a revelation to what the most kindly of their number had called "the new gospel of a shallow naturalism" seemed scarcely less momentous. Parker never made allowance for the fact that his own jubilant assurance of a divine parent full of tenderness for men could not be shared by all who ceased to base this belief upon a scriptural record. Yet Mill, Parker's peer in intelligence and in devotion to the service of his fellows, could discover no more than a possible deity of limited powers, and Tennyson—far from observing that "the Almighty takes such bounteous care of all little things that no animal can be found all of whose wants are not perfectly satisfied"—heard through the raven of the lower creation, a shriek of protest against the creeds of men. It must also be remembered that he who found only empty bluster in the Southern threat of secession might be over-bitter in criticism of neighbors who believed what the event afterwards proved, and who regarded the maintenance of the Union a fundamental condition of human progress.

The complementary qualities that make for the improvement of man's condition must find embodiment in different individuals. It is fortunate when one of these qualities, calling for change in the conception of the religious life, is so robustly represented as in Parker. Of the books that bring the fearless preacher before another generation, Mr. Chadwick's—though not the most voluminous—is easily the best. It is fortunate that, owing to his early death, Parker left friends so able to do justice to the spirit that was in him. We are shown the scholar as a persistent truth-seeker, the minister "never engaged in the attempt to make his inherited opinions plausible and satisfactory," the sternest censor of his time overshadowed by a nature full of love and sympathy. This "transcendentalist with an inductive attachment" supplied the missing link between the serene philosophy of Concord and the persistent push of physical science. He stood before his people as one whose convictions were contagious, whose words could rivet the attention of the drowsiest church-goer.

Without this man the history of Boston would be less worthy than it is ; and his uplifting influence reached far over the nation and beyond the sea.

J. P. QUINCY.

A Life of Francis Parkman. By CHARLES HAIGHT FARNHAM. (Boston : Little, Brown, and Company. 1900. Pp. xv, 394.)

AT first glance, Mr. Farnham's *Life of Francis Parkman* must be disturbing to those who knew how slight was Parkman's patience with the vagaries of New England philosophy. When in the authorized biography of such a man you find a whole section devoted to what the table of contents calls his "spiritual growth," and when this section is formally preceded by others on the man "as seen in his works," and on his "preparation," you half dread to read, fearing lest you shall find the outlines of an heroic life weakened and distorted by sentimentality. This superficial aspect of Mr. Farnham's book deserves remark, because its very superficiality makes it salient. In truth it is almost the only fault of a work which should come to be recognized as a masterpiece of literary portraiture.

The merit of this work is the more unusual if, as the terms of its plan suggest, Mr. Farnham is temperamentally disposed to sympathize with Transcendentalism, and with Reform, and with whatever else tended romantically and ardently to disintegrate that sturdy old New England in whose later days Parkman found his own sympathies increasingly conservative. But, after all, Mr. Farnham shows qualities which could counterbalance any temperamental bias. In the first place, he has an exceptional power of placing himself in cordial sympathy with his immediate subject ; in the second, he has a still more exceptional power of seeking only to perceive the truth and to set it forth truthfully. From this results a style at once unobtrusive and efficient. You are rarely aware of Mr. Farnham's phrasing ; you are never at a loss to understand what he means. From beginning to end of his book you are in the presence of the remarkable personality which this work will keep alive for those who care to know it.

The vividness of Mr. Farnham's portrait any one must feel. To appreciate its fidelity one must perhaps have had the happiness to know Parkman with some approach to familiarity. Except in its more personal aspects his life was uneventful. Its incidents were only those of a ceaseless struggle with physical and mental obstacles which would have proved fatal to almost any courage but his. The historical work which he accomplished every one knows. What can truly be known only to the comparatively few who chanced to meet him in his later years is the strong, uncompromising, unmistakable individuality of his character. Amid the same persistent braveries which brought into being the masterpieces of our historical literature, this grew to its ripeness. One's memory of Parkman can never be confused with any other ; it is at once human and heroic, affectionate and inspiring. Above all, it is distinct* ineffaceable.

The deepest merit of Mr. Farnham's book, then, is one which only those who knew and cared for Parkman can fully understand. Without violation of that fine reticence which was so deeply inbred in Parkman, Mr. Farnham has given us an unfaltering study of his personality. As you read it, you feel a growing sense that you are once more in the presence of the man, in his habit, as he lived. The hours which you pass with this book are like renewed ones with the friend whose memory it will help to preserve. You lay it down with a feeling of grave, tender content. The future, if it will, may know more than Parkman's work ; it may know Parkman, too.

BARRETT WENDELL.

A History of Banking in the United States. By the late JOHN JAY KNOX, assisted by a corps of financial writers in the various States. The entire work carefully revised and brought up to date by BRADFORD RHODES, editor of the *Bankers' Magazine*, and ELMER H. YOUNGMAN, associate editor. (New York : Bradford Rhodes and Co. 1900. Pp. xxii, 880.)

THE academic world of patient investigation and reflective analysis as well as the more active world of political administration and finance has been greatly indebted in the past to Mr. Knox for his contributions to the history of government monetary issues and banking institutions,—contributions characterized by careful inquiry, candid spirit and lucid statement. Mr. Knox was Deputy Comptroller and Comptroller of the Currency from 1867 to 1884, during which period the national banking system was fiercely assailed. Thus he enjoyed abundant opportunities for acquiring information not only through the archives of the office, but also through a large and intimate acquaintance with bankers throughout the country. During this long period of service, he set a praiseworthy example as a government official, in incorporating into his annual reports the results of historical research. He thus made his documents of permanent value to the student. The reports of 1875 and 1876 are notable illustrations. The researches of Mr. Knox led him in two directions,—one into the history of government treasury notes, and the other into that of the origin and development of banking institutions in the United States. The results of the first of these studies were published in 1884 in the volume entitled *United States Notes*. That book met with general approval, and has since passed through several editions. Although compact in its compass, it contains the essential facts, and presents them in a style appropriate to the scheme adopted by the author. The second task Mr. Knox did not live to complete. It was far more difficult to accomplish than the former, for it demanded a separate banking study for each of the states ; and as there has been a great variety of systems with no uniform development, and as in many cases there are few public documents which can be relied upon for information, the gathering of the material was naturally slow and perplexing. Mr. Knox left

the government service in 1884, and from that time until his death in 1892 was actively engaged in the banking business in New York. The opportunities for continuous inquiry were consequently broken, although the historical interest still remained.

The editor's preface states that Mr. Knox substantially finished his study relating to national banks, and accumulated a large part of the facts desired for treating of state banks, "but did not live to finish what he regarded as one of the most important undertakings of his life." The completion of the work was then put into the hands of the editors of Rhodes's *Journal of Banking* to which Mr. Knox from time to time had contributed a series of studies. These editors in turn called into co-operation a large number of assistants from different states to amplify the local studies. Acknowledgment is also made of the assistance rendered by Mr. William B. Greene, for many years in the Comptroller's office, and familiar with the plans of Mr. Knox. The result of the labors of these various editors, contributors, and advisers, is the work now before us,—a large volume of nearly nine hundred pages. Like all others prepared under such circumstances it is in many ways unsatisfactory. It is a compilation rather than a well-digested treatise; and judged even as a compilation, it is open to objection because of the repetitions. Nevertheless when account is taken of the conditions controlling the production of the work, the public is largely debarred from criticism and should be thankful for what is given.

There are two ways in which the history of banking may be studied,—one relates to the machinery of banking, the laws controlling the incorporation and the management of banks, with an account of the political relationships thus developed, and a description of the various technical processes by which the bank carries on its operations; the other relates to the social and economic influence of banks upon the general life of the people.

Most of the banking studies thus far made will be found in the first class, and this work is no exception. It is a record of annals,—dates, names, events and summaries of laws,—rather than an historical narrative which takes into account the forces shaping the development of banks and the consequences to the people in benefits or evils. The merit of this particular work is that it presents these annals in a more compendious and detailed form than can be found in any other volume.

Part I., pp. 1-304, is directed to the history of banks operating under federal laws, including the Bank of North America, the First and Second United States Banks, and the national banks. For this earlier portion the treatment does not disclose any new or wide research, or even familiarity with the detailed labors of Professor Sumner as witnessed in *The Financier and Finances of the American Revolution*, and [the life of Andrew Jackson. Occasionally there is an interesting expression of judgment in regard to men and the course of events. The author believes that if a bank had been established in 1775, it would have resulted in ample financial resources which would have given to Congress greater authority

and diminished that of the states. In this way a strong and centralized government might have been more quickly brought about. The First United States Bank is termed a great monopoly, useful no doubt, but a foreign importation and as a monopoly opposed to the genius of American institutions ; the removal of the deposits by Jackson and the issue of the specie circular were acts of financial recklessness ; and Tyler is characterized as narrow and mediocre.

The chapters on the national banking system are naturally the best in the book. Mr. Knox clearly appreciated the fundamental significance of the long continued struggle after the Civil War to substitute treasury notes in place of bank notes, and more than this, understood the administration influences which in unsuspected ways contributed to the support of the greenback in its rivalry with the bank notes.

"With legal tender notes, the Treasurer's office, which had charge of the preparation, signing, issuing and redemption of these notes, gradually acquired more power. The Treasurer was a much more important official with greatly increased patronage. The handling of the United States notes caused him to be in more frequent consultation with the Secretary. The office of the Comptroller of the Currency did not tend to establish so close relations. In fact, there were from a very early day two factions in the Treasury Department, the legal tender faction and the national bank faction. The former, whenever they had opportunity, did what they could to prevent the retirement of legal tender notes and the substitution therefor of national bank currency. Many of the most effective arguments against the banks were furnished to members of Congress from this source" (p. 149).

Part II. of the work treats of banking under state laws. The history of each state is taken up separately, there being no attempt to bring these several local experiences into one comprehensive survey or series of generalizations. The data will be serviceable to the future historian, but this portion as it now stands is of little interest as a narrative. Use has been made of the *Sound Currency Monographs* issued by the Reform Club of New York. This material will supplement the volume on United States banking prepared by Professor Sumner for the encyclopedic history of banking in all countries.

The following errors have been noted : The date 1781, on page 39, should be 1791 ; Woodbury was not Secretary of the Treasury in 1833, as mentioned on page 70, but Secretary of the Navy ; Boutelle is written for Boutwell, on page 149 ; Jurdan for Jordan, on page 222 ; the date on page 96, January 8, 1863, should be changed to 1862 ; and on page 125, the dollar sign has slipped in before the figures 6, 505, 930. The most serious error, however, is the confusion occasioned by Chapters 14-16 on the national banking system, which repeat much of what appears in previous chapters. The reader would have a more correct understanding if this matter had been incorporated into the main narrative.

DAVIS RICH DEWEY.

A History of Tennessee from 1663 to 1900 for Use in Schools. By G. R. MCGEE, Principal of College Street School, Jackson, Tennessee. (New York: The American Book Company. Pp. xxxix, 238.)

History of Tennessee, its People and its Institutions. By WILLIAM ROBERTSON GARRETT, A.M., Ph.D., Professor of American History in Peabody Normal College, and ALBERT VIRGIL GOODPASTURE, A.M., formerly Clerk of the Supreme Court of Tennessee. (Nashville: Brandon Printing Company. Pp. 350.)

THE first permanent settlement in the present state of Tennessee was made in the valley of the Watauga, a branch of the Holston River, in 1769, and ten years later the Cumberland settlements on the present site of Nashville were started. In 1790 the territory west of the ridge of the Smoky Mountains was deeded by North Carolina to the national government and was organized as the "Territory South of the River Ohio." The first territorial legislature under the terms of the cession (the Northwest Ordinance without the anti-slavery section) sat in 1794, and two years later the people organized themselves into the state of Tennessee and demanded admission into the union of states as a right under the compact of cession.

The constitution of 1796 contained several peculiarities characteristic of the period and of local conditions. All power of administration, legislation and legal procedure was placed in the hands or under the control of the governor and legislature, and they were held accountable to the people by biennial popular elections for the management of their trusts. The general, and most local, officers, including the judges, were their appointees. Land, polls and stud horses were the only objects taxed by the constitution: no 100-acre parcel to be taxed more than any other, and no town lot or free poll more than 100 acres; slave polls at twice the rate of free polls. As time went on the democratizing movement affected Tennessee. Land also differentiated more in value, the land speculators lost in influence, and personal property increased in relative importance. The constitution of 1834 made most of the officials, local and general, elective, and readjusted the basis of taxation in harmony with the economic conditions. In 1853 an amendment made even the Supreme Court judges subject to popular election for terms of eight years, and the constitution of 1870 made "all" property taxable at its value.

After 1825, at latest, state politics were dominated by national. But internal improvements and state charitable institutions were fostered. Especially in respect of the latter the state was very progressive.

The state refused to secede, in January, 1861, and only withdrew after Lincoln's call for troops. It was one of the great battle-grounds of the Civil War. It was also the first in which military government was set up (1862), and it was therefore excepted from the Emancipation Proclamation. It abolished slavery in 1865, and in 1866 its senators

and representatives were allowed to resume their seats in Congress. Thus Tennessee was the first of the seceding states to be recognized by all three departments of the national government and escaped congressional reconstruction and carpet-bag rule. But the animosities of its citizens were bitter enough. In 1870, by the connivance of Governor Senter, who sought re-election, a majority of the male citizens of full age voted, and thus the democrats were returned to power.

Both of the books named above have been published for use in the schools of Tennessee. McGee's book is addressed "To the Girls and Boys of Tennessee" and, allowing for its limited scope and purpose, is almost above criticism. In many difficult passages, in the one treating of Governor Senter's re-election among others, the author displays historical abilities worthier of a larger scope and a more critical audience. His account of the Tennessee Centennial Exposition held in 1897 to celebrate the completion of 100 years of statehood is, however, undignified and silly. Two features of that exposition which were especially successful and distinctive were the display of the raw products of the South, from field, forest and mine, and the architecture. The Art Building was an exact reproduction of the Parthenon in external form, size, and decorations, and all the chief buildings were in either the pure Greek or the colonial style, formerly so much used in the south.

The other book, though immediately designed for use in the higher grades, in compliance with the new text-book law, is in places more pretentious than a text-book and deserves consideration on more general grounds. It is a brief but compendious history of the state, containing the best that is to be found in Haywood, Ramsey and Phelan, correcting errors, exploding myths, and adding fresh material. The statements of fact are reliable, and the authors have shown great diligence in collecting them. The most valuable contributions are the chapters on the Indian treaties and land cessions, with new maps drawn from the data. These are subjects on which the authors are specialists.

There is so much action in the early period that the narrative seldom fails to be interesting. But chapter after chapter in the period after 1815 is a mere chronicle of events and series of biographical sketches. The authors lack literary finish, historical perspective, power of generalization and power of interpretation. The mutiny of the Tennessee troops in the Creek campaign (Fort Strother, Alabama, December, 1813) is rhetorically attributed to deficient "fortitude." In fact it was due to the faulty militia system of defense against the Indians, a system which deserved full discussion. General Jackson is praised for the spectacular events of January 8, 1815, and nothing is said of his memorable display of military genius by the attack of December 23, 1814. It would take a Cuvier to reconstruct from the dry bones of constitutional change scattered through the book any semblance to the organic development which actually took place from 1796 to 1870. Internal improvements which the constitution of 1834 was designed to promote, are treated of towards the close of the book in a chapter entitled: "The Constitution of 1870 Prohibits

State Aid to Internal Improvements." The encroachment of national politics into state affairs, especially under Jackson's influence, is noted as a fact. But the similar experience of other states is not adverted to, nor is its inevitableness discussed, nor the dwarfing effect upon state politics, nor the consolidating effect, through the aggrandizement of national at the expense of state interests; all of them legitimate questions, and pertinent, as showing the practical effect of our peculiar double system upon the relative spheres and reciprocal relations of the state and the national governments.

Most of the episodes of Tennessee history are not peculiar to her alone. They have their local details and coloring. They may have been more intense in Tennessee than in other states, or less so. But they were mere parts of broad movements, and it would have added greatly to the value of this book for every purpose if more attention had been paid to the fact. The second edition, it is understood, will be printed from revised plates.

FREDERICK W. MOORE.

Pausanias and other Greek Sketches, by J. G. Frazer. (Macmillan, pp. x, 419.) This attractive little volume contains first—as Mr. Frazer states in his preface—a reprint of that chapter upon Pausanias which served as an introduction to his voluminous and scholarly commentary upon that author. This is published without change, save the omission of the numerous footnotes which accompany the commentary. The essay upon Pericles is reprinted in the same way from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. The other sketches are extracts, in whole or in part, from the commentary. The greater part of these are descriptions of those places mentioned by Pausanias, and of the routes over which he journeyed. In a few instances accounts are given of places not visited by the ancient traveller, but well worth the attention of those who would follow in his footsteps. Some of the sketches are almost entirely rewritten,—that on the Lernaean Marsh, p. 266, and that on the road to Olympia, p. 287; others are published without change. As parts of Mr. Frazer's commentary upon the travels of Pausanias these descriptions add a needed touch of local color and of present interest to his account of the antiquarian and religious side of Greek life. Separately printed they will prove a welcome addition to the sources of information at the disposition of the modern traveller in Greece, while the admirable literary quality of the book will commend it to a larger audience.

Rome: Its Rise and Fall. A Text-book for High Schools and Colleges, by P. V. N. MYERS, L.H.D. (Boston, Ginn, pp. xii, 554). This new history of Rome—an expansion of a smaller work by the same author—has all of Mr. Myers's characteristic merits. The style is simple, lively, and on the whole, clear; the book contains abundance of anecdote and of other illustrative matter. The author aims, too, to show the significance of events, and introduces many instructive analogies from modern

history and government. With its bibliographies, maps, and pictures, the work is pedagogically admirable ; in brief, it is probably as teachable as anything Mr. Myers has written.

Unfortunately, however, we have a different story to tell of its accuracy. Probably no other elementary history of Rome in existence is so thoroughly untrustworthy from beginning to end. A large class of the misconceptions and errors it contains are due to the author's ignorance of recent progress in the study of Roman history and to his inability to discriminate between good and poor authority. In his treatment of primitive Rome, for instance, he tries to follow Mommsen's *History of Rome* ; but had he wished to learn Mommsen's later and more reasonable views, he should have read the *Staatsrecht*. For the earliest institutions of Rome, however, Eduard Meyer is far superior to Mommsen, while the soundest principles of criticism must now be learned from Herzog. But if the maker of a text-book is to be excused from consulting such authorities, at least he might learn from Pelham that the Roman *curiae* contained plebeians and clients as well as patricians. The artificial and absolutely groundless theory that in the beginning the citizens were exclusively patrician distorts all the early history of Rome. Again, Mr. Myers fills the fifth century B. C. with agrarian agitation, whereas in fact the trouble over the disposition of acquired land could not have begun before the fourth century. From these instances it will be seen that the author's misconceptions involve not isolated points merely, but whole periods and long continued developments.

Another large class of errors, due to sheer carelessness, might have been avoided by consulting the most ordinary text-book on the subject. Mr. Myers tells us, for example, that the *comitium* was a platform and the *rostra* a desk, that the Latin League was "re-established" in 493 B. C., and that the Valerian-Horatian Laws, passed in 449 B. C., instituted the "military quaestorship !" Blunders equally absurd occur on nearly every page ; on some pages the reader may search in vain for a correct statement. Considering how widely this text-book will probably be used, ought we not to pity the great number of boys and girls who will be taught to look upon such nonsense as Roman history ?

G. W. B.

Part XXVII. of Dr. R. L. Poole's *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe* (Clarendon Press) contains a map of Europe at the accession of Charles V., with letter-press by Mr. C. Oman, in which the rivalry between the Ottoman Empire and that of Charles is strongly emphasized ; one by the editor, of England and Wales, showing the parliamentary representation according to the Reform Act of 1832 ; and one by Miss Lina Eckenstein, of Italy from about 1060 to 1167. The atlas approaches its conclusion.

Source-Book of English History, edited by Elizabeth Kimball Kendall, Associate Professor of History of Wellesley College. (Macmillan, pp. xxii, 483.) Miss Kendall's book is intended for the use of boys and girls of about sixteen. It does not attempt to illustrate English his-

tory continuously, but deals avowedly with selected periods. Twenty-two epochs are thus treated, beginning with the Britons and Saxons and coming down to the modern Empire. In the early part of the book one is disposed to cavil somewhat at the sense of proportion which gave to the Hundred Years' War more illustrative material than was thought necessary for the constitutional struggles of the preceding century. The Wars of the Roses are similarly magnified into undue importance. The Tudor and Puritan periods are treated with some fulness, and the selections are well-chosen. They are almost entirely of a descriptive sort. The only statutory material for the Tudor period is a law against the keeping of sheep, 1534. Among other interesting selections are quotations from the reports of the Venetian ambassador, Giacomo Soranzo, a news-letter to Wentworth, letters of Charles I. to Strafford, an extract from Lord Ashley's report on child-labor, and Mrs. Harris's description of the Indian mutiny at Lucknow.

The nineteenth century is treated at greatest length, having over a hundred pages given it out of 465. Miss Kendall justifies this on the ground "of the great difficulty in gaining access to the original materials of the last three centuries."

The make-up of the book is satisfactory save as respects the marginal annotations, which confuse notices of authors and authorities quoted with comments upon the text. There is a good index in which the names of authors are accented.

Source-Book of English History, by Guy Carleton Lee, Ph.D. (Henry Holt and Co., pp. 585.) This book is, for the main part, a repository of good material, well-selected. Part I. is a bibliography of sources, covering some 60 pages, and deserving especial mention because such lists might well be included in the prevalent source-book, and, as a rule, are not. The remaining 520 pages contain a varied collection of documents and extracts, which are rather institutional and legal than descriptive. The text of many important documents and statutes is given in full. Among these, one may mention the Constitutions of Clarendon, Magna Charta, the Statute of Praemunire, the Statute of Laborers, the Instrument of Government, and the Habeas Corpus Act. This is material the lack of which has been felt in similar compilations. The last 80 pages, dealing with the nineteenth century, are open to the objection of being largely taken from secondary material. This is at once unscholarly and unnecessary. Molesworth's *History of the Reform*, Gammage's *History of the Chartist Movement*, and Levi's *History of British Commerce* cannot be classed as sources, and it is not apparent why extracts from these and similar works are included in Mr. Lee's collection.

The Cely Papers; Selections from the Correspondence and Memoranda of the Cely Family, Merchants of the Staple, A. D. 1475-1488. Edited for the Royal Historical Society by Henry Elliot Malden (Longmans, pp. liii, 214). Inevitably the comparison of the Paston Letters suggests itself in connection with such a publication. The Cely papers, discov-

ered some years ago amongst the Chancery Miscellanea of the Public Record Office, by no means equal in interest that famous collection. Yet they are of great interest, and Mr. Malden, in his able preface, has skilfully pointed out in just what ways this is true. Richard Cely of Mark Lane and of Bretts in Essex, and his three sons, Richard, Robert and George, were merchants of the Staple doing business in London and constantly maintaining a junior member of the firm at Calais, where the staple for wool was situated in their time. They were well-to-do persons, whose business led them on considerable journeys and familiarized them with large affairs. Their correspondence, exceedingly well edited, illustrates the whole history of the woollen trade, from the gathering of wool (varied by courting) in the Cotswolds to its sale to Flemish and other merchants (varied apparently by smuggling, privateering and possibly piracy) at Calais. The editor's preface elucidates fully the organization of the merchants of the Staple and the operations of the woollen trade, and the relations which it bore during these years to the complications of international politics. There are brief appendixes on contemporary coinage and on the contemporary wool marts.

Mr. Charles H. Firth has edited for the same society *The Narrative of General Venables*, with an Appendix of Papers relating to the Expedition to the West Indies and the Conquest of Jamaica, 1654-1655 (Longmans, pp. xli, 180). Venables's narrative is derived from two manuscripts in the British Museum. Its object is to vindicate his own conduct as general, and to show that the disasters which befell the expedition were due to the mistakes and misconduct of Admiral Penn and others. He quotes a good number of letters in various support of his contention, and concludes with a refutation of the anonymous "Brief and Perfect Journal of the late Proceedings and Success of the English Army in the West Indies, by I. S., an Eyewitness," printed in the *Harleian Miscellany*, Vol. III. The appendixes contain the instructions given to those who were to prepare the expedition, the commission given to the commissioners who were to command it, the instructions given to Venables as general, a contemporary list of the forces, certain additional papers of Venables, a journal or series of letters relating to the expedition, from an anonymous manuscript in the Rawlinson collection, some extracts from the journal of one Henry Whistler, and certain pieces from the unpublished Thurloe MSS., among them a Spanish warning not to trespass, couched in strange English, which English sailors found on the deserted island of the Tortugas. Beside this illustrative matter, Mr Firth has supplied, in an excellent introduction, an account of the commissioners (of whom, it will be remembered, Edward Winslow was one), of the officers, of the forces, and of the events and mistakes of the expedition.

Essai sur le Système de Politique Étrangère de J. J. Rousseau : La République Confédérative des Petits États, par J. L. Windenberger, Professeur au Lycée de Chaumont. (Paris : Picard, pp. 308.) At a

time when the relations between states are so frequently a subject of discussion in the domain of political science, it is interesting to go back and examine the international politics of the great revolutionist of the eighteenth century. M. Windenberger begins his work with a review of the system of Rousseau as applied to a single state, but follows the enquiry a stage farther. Assuming the existence of a social contract, how shall the small state, which was Rousseau's ideal, maintain itself in the presence of powerful and aggressive neighbors? This difficulty, Rousseau thought, could not be met by the aid of religious principles alone, nor could the solution be found in war. The true remedy is the application of the principle of contract to international relations. As the free consent of individuals forms the state, so on a larger scale the free consent of states may be the basis of an association of states protecting all its members. Rousseau's idea was, so reasons the author, that this protective association should not be a mere league, since this would be too ephemeral in nature to afford the security desired; nor yet a federal state in which protection might be obtained, but at the cost of the sovereignty of the contracting states. The proper form of association is the confederacy, in which the several states retain their independence and sovereignty.

M. Windenberger asserts, and repeats the assertion, that Rousseau's international contract corresponds exactly to the social contract (pp. 234, 251). As the author himself shows, however, in the social contract the parties to the agreement forfeit their sovereignty, and the state becomes the sole judge of its own competence. But in the confederation (which he carefully distinguishes from the federal state) the parties to the contract retain their individual independence and sovereignty. At this important point the analogy breaks down. It is true that as far as the *purpose* is concerned Rousseau's social and his international contract are alike in that they rest upon the desire for common protection; in result, however, the contracts are widely different, since one involves a loss of sovereignty on the part of the contracting parties, while the other imposes no such necessity.

M. Windenberger's book presents a careful and complete study of the international politics of Rousseau, but all that is new in his discussion might easily have been stated with greater brevity. The last 50 pages of the book contain interesting extracts from the Geneva manuscript of the *Contrat Social*, and unpublished manuscripts in the Neuchâtel library.

C. E. MERRIAM.

We have received the fifth and sixth volumes of the *Skrifter utgifna af Kongl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Upsala* (Upsala, C. J. Lundström). Each contains several papers of historical interest. In Band V. Professor Karl Piehl discusses certain brief inscriptions, of the later periods of Egyptian history, coming from the temple of Horus at Edfou. J. M. Sundén, "De Tribunicia Potestate a L. Sulla imminuta Quaestiones," deals especially with the question whether Sulla abolished

the legislative power exercised by the tribunes by means of the plebiscita, or only, as maintained by Mommsen, limited it by requiring the previous assent of the senate; he holds that it was abolished. Professor P. Persson investigates an inscription discovered a few years ago at Tarentum (*Monumenti Antichi*, VI. 411 ff.), containing a portion of the laws of the municipium, of date between 89 and 62 B. C. Mr. I. S. Landtmanson discusses, chiefly upon the basis of the territorial codes, the closing period of slavery in Sweden, down to King Magnus Eriksson's ordinance of Skara, 1335. Finally there is an essay by Professor Harold Hjärne on the negotiations between Sweden and Russia from 1564 to 1572 and the efforts of Eric XIV. and Ivan IV. toward mutual alliance in view of their respective wars against Denmark and Poland and the disaffection existing within their kingdoms. In Band VI. Dr. E. Wadstein essays a new interpretation of the runic inscription on the ring of the church-door of Forsa, the oldest of Swedish legal inscriptions, and examines (in an article written in English) the Clermont runic casket in the British Museum (with plates), giving the first interpretation of the figures and inscription on the missing side-piece, which has lately come into the possession of the municipal museum at Florence. Dr. C. Hallendorff discusses the policy of King Augustus of Saxony and Poland in 1700 and 1701, more especially with reference to his plans for the joint attack of Russia, Denmark and his own subjects on Sweden. Dr. K. Ahlenius continues his studies of Olaus Magnus and his northern geography by a careful study of the geography and cartography of Scandinavia in the latter half of the sixteenth century, as represented by Continental and Scandinavian authorities. The papers in these volumes are written in Swedish, Latin, German, French and English. Some of those written in Swedish are accompanied with summaries in German.

The Royal Historical Society has published Vol. I. of *The Despatches and Correspondence of John, Second Earl of Buckinghamshire, Ambassador to the Court of Catherine II. of Russia, 1762-1765* (Longmans, pp. 256), edited by Miss Adelaide D'Arcy Collier. The editor contributes an excellent introduction, giving an account of the diplomatic relations between England and Russia from 1739 and the conclusion of the Anglo-Russian alliance in 1742 down to the time when Lord Buckinghamshire set out on his mission. He was accredited to Peter III., Keith having become unacceptable to the new czar because of a suspicion that he was unfaithful to Frederick of Prussia. But before the new ambassador left England, news came of the revolution which had brought to the throne the Empress Catherine II., and his instructions were composed with this in view. It was to have been expected that those instructions should have been printed in this volume, but they are not. The papers which it contains are Lord Buckinghamshire's own papers, preserved at his house of Blickling in Norfolk, and now possessed by the Marchioness of Lothian. Most of them were discovered recently, since the report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission on the earl's despatches. In part

they consist of the ambassador's letters to the Secretary of State, Halifax, to his friend George Grenville, to Lady Suffolk and others; in part of his "Russian Memoranda," disconnected pieces written apparently on his return voyage; in part of letters, despatches and memoranda written by other diplomats, of which he was furnished with copies. The most important of these last are two memoirs, by Finckenstein and Sir Andrew Mitchell, respectively, written in September 1762, and occupying an important position in the records of the "strained relations" between Lord Bute's government and Frederick the Great. Thorough and excellent annotations help the diplomatic story. Moreover Lord Buckinghamshire writes well, and shows much that is interesting respecting the court of Catherine in the earlier part of her reign. An appendix contains a "système" drawn up by Bestushev Rjumin for the Empress Elizabeth at the beginning of the year 1744.

Adam Duncan, by H. W. Wilson. [The Westminster Biographies.] (Boston, Small, Maynard and Co., pp. xvi, 156.) Mr. Wilson's preface gives his reasons for including in the limited space at his disposal a description of life in the English navy in the latter half of the eighteenth century. Admiral Duncan's conspicuous services to his country were so closely connected with the shortcomings of the naval administration of that period and the embarrassments and dangers that ensued that one cannot truly appreciate his character as man or as commander without a knowledge of the circumstances under which he acted. Mr. Wilson's admirable little biography is its own justification of his method of dealing with his subject. That it should show throughout evidences of careful study and investigation—although especially disclaiming all "pretence at originality"—one would expect. The battle of Camperdown, for example, is described in detail and with a clearness which must make it intelligible to the "general reader," for whom the book is primarily written. The tactical peculiarities of the battle are duly emphasized. The author has carefully examined the available evidence, and has arrived at the conclusion that Duncan did not anticipate Nelson's action at Trafalgar in attempting to destroy the enemy by concentrating the English fleet upon him in detail. Such concentration as took place at Camperdown was the result of accident rather than design. Duncan's inspiration was in deciding to pass through the Dutch line and engage the enemy to leeward, thus cutting off all chance of retreat.

A Survey of American History; Source Extracts, by Howard W. Caldwell, A.M., Professor of American History in the University of Nebraska. Vol. I. (Chicago, Ainsworth and Co., pp. 255). For some time past Professor Caldwell has been publishing in a Nebraska educational journal a series of historical studies, intended to aid teachers by presenting for each of several important topics in American history a selection of extracts from the original documents and writings, accompanied with comments and elucidations. Ten of these are now grouped in a volume with the above title. They relate respectively to the found-

ing of the colonies, the development of union among them, the causes of the Revolution, the formation of the Constitution, its interpretation with respect to the question of nationality, the history of slavery, the Civil War and reconstruction, foreign relations and economic history. The chief differences between this and the other small source-books are the presence of much more than the usual amount of comment intended to direct the teacher in the use of the book, and the fact that its extracts are usually quite brief quotations, often much compressed by elision. Many interesting bits are presented, which it will do teachers good to contemplate. Yet the book seems scrappy, and it is questionable whether its plan is a wise one. The author would concede that in no one of his chapters are the quotations sufficient of themselves to enable the student to form a judgment. Especially is this true of the last two studies, which present only a few items in two vast fields. The question is, whether the student does not get more of that for which the study of original materials is valuable, by studying thoroughly the whole of a small number of documents so selected that by their means he acquires something like a complete knowledge of a few transactions.

Stephen Decatur, by Cyrus Townsend Brady. [The Beacon Biographies]. (Boston: Small, Maynard and Co., 1900, pp. xviii, 142.) Mr. Brady has had access to material belonging to the descendants of Decatur, and has also drawn upon the manuscript collections of the Pennsylvania Historical Society. The result of his efforts is a clear and graphic description of the man and his work, in which the picturesque and heroic largely predominate.

The burning of the *Philadelphia* in the harbor of Tripoli, and the battle with the Tripolitans which followed, are given with great fullness of detail. So also are the engagements between the *Macedonian* and the *United States* where Decatur first commanded as a captain, and that resulting in the loss of the *President* after a gallant struggle against overwhelming odds. The greater part of the book is occupied with "wars and rumors of wars." Mr. Brady is frankly a hero-worshipper, and treats his subject with an open admiration that at times amounts to naïveté. He regards with undisguised indignation all slurs or criticisms upon his idol. This method of writing historical biography is not judicial, but it may fairly be said that it is in great part its own corrective.

The fifteenth volume of the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, second series, embraces the records of meetings held from March 1899 to February 1900 inclusive, the first series of meetings held in the Society's new building, of which a heliotype picture is given. Among the papers included are the address of the President, Mr. Charles Francis Adams, on Historians and Historical Societies, an address read upon the occasion of the formal opening of the building; a careful paper by Mr. John T. Hassam on the early attempts at colonization in the Bahama Islands; and two papers by Mr. Andrew McF. Davis on the provincial currency of Massachusetts, the latter a curious study of Occult

Methods of Protecting the Provincial Currency. Mr. C. F. Adams has a paper on the Detention of the Laird Rams, exploding, with the aid of his father's papers and the *Life of John M. Forbes*, the legendary elements in the account of the matter presented by the late Mr. L. E. Chittenden in his *Recollections of President Lincoln and his Administration*. It is worth while remarking that this, and some remarks by the same writer on the battle of New Orleans, are practically the only papers in the volume, save obituary notices, that deal with any matters subsequent to 1775. Mr. Robert N. Toppan communicates to the *Proceedings* the full text of the Council records of Massachusetts under the administration of President Joseph Dudley, derived from a transcript in the Massachusetts archives and ultimately from the Public Record Office in London. These records, sixty pages in extent, supplement the Andros records which Mr. Toppan has already printed in the *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*.

Vol. III. of the *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, a substantial volume of 577 pages, embraces the proceedings of the society from January 1895 to April 1897 inclusive. There is much valuable matter in the book, along with some conventional antiquarianism. Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis follows up a definite and important line of research in a paper on Provincial Banks, Land and Silver, and presents another on the case of Frost *vs.* Leighton, previously discussed in this REVIEW (II. 229). To the former of these subjects Mr. Davis recurs in the portion of Vol. V. which has been issued, in a paper called a Connecticut Land Bank, relating to the New London Society United for Trade and Commerce, chartered by the Connecticut Assembly in 1732. This, like the Massachusetts Land Banks of 1686 and 1714, he finds to have been due to the influence of the pamphlet, *A Model for Erecting a Bank of Credit*, London, 1684 and 1688. Mr. John Noble, clerk of the Supreme Judicial Court, of whose arrangement of the very extensive files of that court we have already spoken, contributes papers on the Trial and Punishment of Crime in the Massachusetts of the seventeenth century, on the libel suit of Knowles *vs.* Douglass, 1748, 1749, and other matters from his Suffolk files. Mr. A. P. C. Griffin's bibliography of the historical publications of the New England states also deserves notice. Professor George L. Goodale of Harvard University, the eminent botanist, has an interesting essay on New England plants seen by the earliest colonists; Mr. Henry D. Sedgwick, one on Robert Sedgwick. Many interesting letters or documents are produced and commented on, especially a letter of President Dunster to a committee of the General Court in 1653, of real importance to the history of Harvard College. The commemoration of deceased members occupies, in the sum, 126 pages; the index, marked by extraordinary elaboration, eighty-seven. Vol. II. is to contain the commissions and instructions of the royal governors of Massachusetts, their commissions as vice-admirals, and the commission of Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London, a document recently discovered, giv-

ing him authority to exercise episcopal jurisdiction in the colonies; but this volume is still delayed. Vol IV. will contain, among other things, a calendar of papers relating to the Land Banks. In the installment of Vol. V. already issued, the most noteworthy matters are a fragment of the original journal of the Massachusetts House of Deputies for 1649, recently discovered, a discussion of the real character of Vol. III. of the printed *Massachusetts Records*, a paper on Henry Pelham, one on some Massachusetts Tories, and one, by Mr. Albert Matthews, of much value as a contribution to our social history, on the history of the expressions "hired man" and "help."

Old Landmarks and Historic Personages of Boston, by Samuel Adams Drake, new and revised edition. (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1900, pp. xviii, 484.) This is an excellent reprint of a deservedly popular book. The text shows frequent alterations from that of the first edition of 1872, but these are for the most part slight in character. The description of the Boston Athenaeum (p. 38) has been rewritten, and throughout the volume changes in phraseology and slight revisions of descriptions are numerous. In many instances the revision has been made in order to adapt the author's statements to such changes as have taken place in the Boston landmarks within the last twenty-five years. The preface has been rewritten, and some full-page illustrations have been added.

Colonial Times on Buzzard's Bay, by William Root Bliss. New edition. (Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1900, pp. 252.) This is the third edition of a readable little book on the institutions and customs prevailing along the upper shores of Buzzard's Bay. The author has made few changes in the text and these of slight significance. The preface is rewritten. An appendix gives a list of property-holders and taxable property in 1783 and 1784. An index has also been added, and the illustrations of the next preceding edition have been happily omitted.

The state of New York has printed three volumes (pp. 857, 879, 744) of the *Public Papers of George Clinton*, edited from the manuscripts possessed by the state by Mr. Hugh Hastings, who occupies the office of "state historian." The plan seems to be to print everything, and a great amount of matter interesting to Revolutionary history is presented. The first volume opens with an introduction of two hundred pages by the editor, practically a general history of the Revolution, which we cannot praise. The papers printed in this volume run from May 1775 to June 1777, those in the second volume to March 1778, those in the third to September of the same year. The editing is done after the manner which we have described in reviewing previous volumes prepared by Mr. Hastings, with almost no footnotes but enough of humorous or journalistic headings, such as "Gen. Heath shy on news," "Col. Hathorn nabs four Tories," etc.

The Cradle of the Republic; Jamestown and James River, by Lyon Gardiner Tyler, President of the College of William and Mary. (Rich-

mond, 1900, pp. 187.) Upon the antiquities of Plymouth and Boston enough has been written to cover with printed pages the greater part of their original settled areas. Meanwhile most Americans know extremely little of Jamestown, and perhaps most of that little is derived from the lively pages of *To Have and To Hold*. Accordingly President Tyler has performed an excellent service in printing this careful and thorough antiquarian account of Jamestown and its region. He traces minutely, in the pages of travellers and others, the history of the island and of the encroachments of the river, still, alas, unchecked, the history of the Indian tribes and the English town, of fort and church and graveyard, of the glass-house, the governor's house and the state house. Finally he takes up in order the old historic estates and other places on the James River, giving the origin of each name and estate and some of the facts of the local history. The book has several good and useful illustrations. The student will wish there were more footnotes or detailed references, since the book is so evidently the fruit of prolonged researches, the casual reader may wish to be tempted along by greater gifts of descriptive style; but it will interest both. It is apparently to be obtained from the author at Williamsburg, Virginia.

The University of Wisconsin: its History and its Alumni, (J. N. Purcell, Madison, 1900), is a folio volume of nearly nine hundred pages. It is artistically bound and printed, and contains many portraits and pictures which illustrate the history of Madison and the University. The editor, Mr. Reuben Gold Thwaites, of the State Historical Society, has had general supervision of the contents. His scholarly sense and good taste doubtless account for the fact that the volume is a sober piece of work of real historical value, and not merely a fulsome, uncritical dissertation upon the glories of the college and her sons. Mr. Thwaites is also author of those portions of the book dealing with the history of the city and the development of the college. It is unnecessary to say that these chapters are well written and give just the sort of information that should be given in a work of this kind. Concerning the value of the short biographies of the alumni, the reviewer cannot express an opinion, except to say that apparently the men who have really accomplished something in the world have been selected for special notice. It cannot be supposed that the publisher has issued this expensive volume for purely philanthropic purposes, but there is little, if any, internal evidence that the portraits represent the countenances of only those who have paid the price. This is high praise for a book of this character. The work was worth doing and it has been done with unusual skill and commendable reserve.

A. C. McL.

The Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Second Series, Vol. V., 1899, has just appeared. Some 450 pages of the volume are made up of papers having an historical interest. The first of these, "L'Expédition du Marquis de Denonville," by M. le juge Girouard, is

an endeavor to fix the official responsibility for the cruel ruse by which a considerable detachment of the Iroquois were invited to meet the governor and intendant of New France at Fort Frontenac in order to conclude a treaty of peace, in 1687, and were there made prisoners, and eventually sent to the galleys in France. Notwithstanding the fact that the survivors were sent back to Canada by royal authority, a few years later, the author arrives at the conclusion that the home government must be held primarily responsible for the outrage. *The Builders of Nova Scotia*, by Sir John G. Bourinot, has been already noticed in these pages. A Monograph on Historic Sites in the Province of New Brunswick, by William F. Ganong, devotes most space to the relics of Indian occupation, and of the Acadian period. Major Arthur G. Doughty has a careful paper, with maps and plans, on the Probable Site of the Battle of the Plains of Abraham. Archbishop O'Brien discusses Cabot's Landfall and Chart, with especial reference to the arguments advanced by Dr. S. E. Dawson in his paper which appeared in the *Transactions* for 1897. There is an article on the Assault of Quebec by Montgomery and Arnold, in 1775, by Sir James Le Moine, and, finally, a lengthy paper entitled The Line of Demarcation of Pope Alexander VI. in 1493 and that of the Treaty of Tordesillas in 1494, by Dr. Dawson, in which the subject is discussed from the point of view of medieval international law.

The *Archaeological Reports of Ontario* are printed as appendixes to the annual reports of the Minister of Education. That for 1898 (pp. 211) consists for the most part of a highly valuable report on the pagan Iroquois of the Grand River Reserve, and especially on their religion and folklore, by Mr. David Boyle, curator of the Archaeological Museum. It has excellent illustrations. The report for 1899 (pp. 199) contains descriptions and texts of their music, an account of the Wyandots, by Dr. Wm. E. Connelley, and notes concerning many Indian village sites in the province of Ontario.

Education in the United States. A Series of Monographs prepared for the United States Exhibit at the Paris Exposition, 1900. Edited by Nicholas Murray Butler, Professor of Philosophy and Education in Columbia University. (Albany, J. B. Lyon Co., two vols., pp. 468, 977.) These volumes are, it is true, mainly devoted to description of the existing state of things. But each of the essays of which they are composed contains something of the history of its especial subject. The monographs are the following, written, it will be seen, by highly competent experts: Educational Organization and Administration, by President A. S. Draper; Kindergarten Education, by Susan E. Blow; Elementary Education, by Dr. W. T. Harris; Secondary Education, by Professor E. E. Brown; The American College, by Professor A. F. West; The American University, by Professor E. D. Perry; Education of Women, by President M. Carey Thomas; Training of Teachers, by the late Professor B. A. Hinsdale; and other monographs more special.

NOTES AND NEWS

Just before our date of publication the American Historical Association holds its annual meeting at Detroit and Ann Arbor, December 27, 28 and 29. Though a full account of the meeting will, as usual, appear in the April number of the REVIEW, a statement of the proceedings as outlined in the final edition of the programme may be convenient for many readers. According to the programme, one session is devoted to the Crusades and the East, with papers by Professor George L. Burr, on the Year One Thousand and Antecedents of the Crusades; by Professor Oliver J. Thatcher on Critical Work on the Sources of the First Crusade; and by President James B. Angell on the Capitulations in Turkey. The latter paper is printed in our present issue. The session of the Church History Section will be marked by papers on American Ecclesiology, by Professor George J. Bayles; on The Origin of the Apostles' Creed, by Professor A. C. McGiffert; and on The Date of the Ignatian Epistles, by Professor Francis A. Christie. In the session devoted to Western History, Professor Edward G. Bourne will read a paper on The Legend of Marcus Whitman (see pp. 276 to 300 of the present issue); Professor Samuel B. Harding on Party Struggles in Missouri, 1861-1865; and Professor Frank H. Hodder a paper relating to the history of the Missouri Compromise. In a session which is given the title of British and American History there will be papers on The Opposition in Parliament, 1765-1775, by Professor Wilbur C. Abbott; on The Breakdown of the Old Colonial System in Canada, by Professor George M. Wrong; on British Rule in Canada, by Sir John Bourinot; and on The Breakdown of Reconstruction, by Professor W. A. Dunning.

The American Economic Association meets at the same time and place and there will be two joint sessions: one in which the presiding officers of the two associations, Mr. J. F. Rhodes and Professor Richard T. Ely, give their inaugural addresses, and another in which three papers of common interest will be read: by Professor Paul S. Reinsch on French and English Experiments with Representative Government in the West Indies; by Professor H. Morse Stephens on The Turning Points in the History of British Administration in India; and by Professor John H. Finley on Our Porto Rican Policy.

Hospitable arrangements have been made for the entertainment of the association by the Detroit Club, the University Club of Detroit, the University of Michigan, General and Mrs. Russell A. Alger and Mrs. George O. Robinson. The list of members of the Association just received exhibits a total of 1590 members. Its *Annual Report* for 1899 arrives just as we go to press.

The Public Archives Commission of the Association, organized at the Boston meeting, in December 1899, under Professor William MacDon-ald of Bowdoin College as chairman, has made considerable progress with the organization of its work. The following persons have been appointed as adjunct members to represent the Commission in their respective states: New Hampshire, Mr. Albert S. Batchellor, Littleton; Massachusetts, Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis, Cambridge; Rhode Island, Mr. Clarence S. Brigham, Providence; Connecticut, Mr. Albert C. Bates, Hartford; New York, Professor Herbert L. Osgood; New Jersey, Mr. William Nelson, Paterson; Pennsylvania, Dr. Herman V. Ames, Philadelphia; Virginia, Mr. William G. Stanard, Richmond; North Carolina, Professor John S. Bassett, Durham; Alabama, Mr. Thomas M. Owen, Birmingham; Mississippi, Professor Franklin L. Riley, University; Louisiana, Mr. William Beer, New Orleans; Ohio, Professor George W. Knight, Columbus; Indiana, Professor James A. Woodburn, Bloomington; Illinois, Professor F. W. Shepardson, Chicago; Iowa, Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh, Iowa City; Kansas, Professor Frank H. Hodder, Lawrence; Michigan, Mr. Harlow S. Person, Ann Arbor; Wisconsin, Dr. Orin G. Libby, Madison; Oregon, Professor F. G. Young, Eugene. The preliminary investigation into the condition of the archives of most of these states is well in hand, and the publication of the preliminary reports will probably be begun in the next report of the Association. The Commission has been so fortunate as to secure the co-operation of Mr. R. R. Bowker, of the *Publishers' Weekly*, who has placed at the disposal of the Commission the material which he has collected for his *State Publications*. In all cases the Commission has sought to work in co-operation with historical societies, state record commissions and individual investigators, with a view not only to greater effectiveness, but also to avoid duplication. The Stokes bill, providing for an investigation of the condition of both state and national records under the sanction of the national government, passed the Senate at the last session of Congress, and was favorably reported in the House. The bill, which has many supporters in Congress, will be pressed as earnestly as possible during the present session.

The Committee of the American Historical Association appointed at Boston to consider a co-operative history of the United States has reported to the Council in favor of the project and asks the Council at the Detroit meeting to appoint a standing committee of five to arrange for the publication of such a work in small volumes, each complete in itself so far as it goes. It is proposed that an editor-in-chief be chosen by the committee, and that the committee have power to make the publishing arrangements, the Association to have no pecuniary responsibility or liability.

Professor Burke A. Hinsdale, who died on November 29, 1900, was at one time Professor of English at Hiram College, Ohio, and later, president of that institution. From 1882 to 1886 he held the position of

Superintendent of Public Schools in Cleveland, and he was at the time of his death Professor of the Science and Art of Teaching at the University of Michigan. He edited the *Life and Works of James A. Garfield*, and wrote several books dealing with the early history of Christianity, as well as *The Old Northwest*, and a work upon the teaching of history.

General William S. Stryker, president of the New Jersey Historical Society and adjutant-general of the State of New Jersey, died on October 29, at the age of sixty-two. Beside compilations of the officers and men of the Revolutionary and civil wars, he wrote a volume on *The Battles of Trenton and Princeton*, published in 1898.

Lieut.-Colonel Max Jähns, author of the well-known *Geschichte der Kriegswissenschaften* and of a life of Moltke yet to be published, died at Berlin on September 19, at the age of sixty-three.

Professor J. F. Jameson of Brown University, managing editor of this review, is to become head of the department of history at the University of Chicago, but will retain his connection with the journal until the issue of the July number, and may, up to that time, be addressed as usual at 196 Bowen Street, Providence.

Rev. Dr. John Gordon has been elected professor of history in Tabor College, Iowa.

The *Revue de Synthèse Historique*, a new journal published in Paris by Léopold Cerf, of which the first number has lately appeared, will endeavor to present, from time to time, summary reviews or conspectuses of the existing state of historical study, now in one field now in another, showing what is done and what is yet to do. While avoiding what is vague and arbitrary, it will essay to keep different parts and aspects of history in relation with each other, and in relation with allied sciences, and to counteract the tendency toward extreme specialization. The first number contains an article on "Histoire et Synthèse," by M. Émile Boutroux; an introduction to the study of the individual regions of France, by M. Pierre Foncin; an article on historical methods in Germany, by Professor Karl Lamprecht; and one on "La Science de l'Histoire d'après M. Xénopol," by M. Paul Lacombe.

An English translation of Professor Helmolt's *Weltgeschichte* will shortly be published by Dodd, Mead and Co.

Economics and Industrial History for Secondary Schools, by Henry W. Thurston (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co.) would seem to be a teacher's manual which attempts to apply the "laboratory" method to the study of economic and industrial problems.

The inaugural address delivered at the conference of the International Law Association, at Rouen, by Judge Simeon E. Baldwin, of New Haven, upon "The Part taken by Courts of Justice in the Development of International Law," has been published in the *Yale Law Journal* for November.

A series of *Historical Leaflets*, containing reprints or translations of documentary material for church history, will be issued by the department of church history in the Crozer Theological Seminary, at Chester, Penn. For the year 1901 such documents have been chosen as relate to the Reformation period.

On December 12 the centennial celebration of the establishment of the seat of government in the District of Columbia took place in Washington. Various addresses were made, including one upon the transfer of the capital from Philadelphia to Washington. In this connection mention may be made of *The Removal of the Seat of Government to the District of Columbia*, two papers read before the District of Columbia Historical Society by Mr. Wilhelmus B. Bryan and Mr. Samuel C. Busey (Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, Senate Document No. 62).

The Macmillan Co. will publish shortly in the "Citizens' Library of Economics, Politics and Sociology," *Colonial Government* by Professor Paul S. Reinsch. The book will treat of the methods of colonization, the forms of colonial government, the relations between colonies and the mother-country, and the special colonial problems of the United States.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

Early Babylonian History down to the End of the Fourth Dynasty of Ur, by Rev. Hugo Radau, is an expansion of a dissertation for the doctor's degree in Columbia University, in 1898. An appendix of 123 pages is devoted to a description and discussion of a valuable collection of Babylonian tablets (some 262 in all) which have been recently acquired by the General Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church in New York.

The Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund for October contains the announcement of the resignation of Dr. F. J. Bliss, so long the Director of Excavations, on account of ill-health. His report contained in this number covers the excavations just concluded at Tell Sandahannah (St. Anna). A Seleucid city was laid bare at this place. The Israelite remains underneath this city were touched only at one point, owing to the expiration of the period of excavation.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Goldschmied, *Die Chronologie des Buches von den Königen* (Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, LIV. 1); R. D. Wilson, *Ecclesiasticus* (Presbyterian and Reformed Review, July); U. Köhler, *Der thukydideische Bericht über die oligarchische Unwälzung in Athen im Jahre 411* (Sitzungsberichte der k. pr. Akademie zu Berlin, July); E. Pais, *Saxum Tarpeium; Osservazioni Topografiche e Giuridiche* (Rivista di Storia Antica, V. 1); L. Cantarelli, *Origine e Governo delle Provincie Africane sotto l'Impero* (ibid.).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

In *Les Moines d'Orient antérieurs au Concile de Chalcédoine* (Paris, Oudin) Dom J. M. Besse considers the history of Eastern monachism chiefly from the standpoint of a student of the origins of the Benedictine rule.

The second volume of Abbé Duchesne's *Fastes Épiscopaux de l'Antienne Gaule* (Paris, Fontemoing, pp. 485) comprises the two Aquitanias, Novempopulania, and the four Lugdunensian provinces, fifty-eight dioceses in all. A third volume will finish this monumental work.

Inscriptionum Hispaniae Christianarum Supplementum, by Dr. Emil Hübner, has been published at Berlin by G. Reimer (pp. 162).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

A new edition of Professor Edwin A. Grosvenor's *Constantinople* is published by Little, Brown and Co. Except for one or two slight verbal alterations the text is in all respects identical with that of the first edition of 1895.

The greater part of Tom. XIX., fasc. 2, of the *Analecta Bollandiana* is devoted to a detailed critical examination of the Franciscan "Legenda Trium Sociorum," which the investigator believes to be, not what it claims to be, but a composition of the latter part of the thirteenth century. Fasc. 3 has an article on Julian of Speyer, another of the biographers of St. Francis; also the Greek legend of St. Alexis, the Greek acts of St. Dometius, and a critical account by Father Paul de Loë of the sources for the biography of Albertus Magnus, whose life the Bollandists will treat under November 15. Both numbers are accompanied by installments of a supplement to Abbé Ulysse Chevalier's *Repertorium Hymnologicum*.

Of Blume and Dreves's *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi*, Vols. XXXV. and XXXVI., just published (Leipzig, O. R. Reisland) contain a collection of rhymed psalters, with some similar documents.

The Cambridge University Press are publishing a translation from the German, by Professor Maitland, of Dr. Otto Gierke's work on *Political Theories of the Middle Age*.

A revised edition of Sir Henry Yule's *Marco Polo* will be brought out by Mr. John Murray, edited by Professor Henri Cordier, with a memoir of Colonel Yule. Mr. Murray also announces the second volume of Mr. C. Raymond Beazley's *Dawn of Modern Geography*.

MODERN HISTORY.

Students of the Reformation should be notified of Dr. A. Erichson's *Bibliographia Calviniana*, announced by C. A. Schwetke and Son of Berlin.

The Hakluyt Society have just published the *Voyage of Captain John Saris to Japan, 1613*, edited by Sir Ernest M. Satow, K.C.M.G., formerly envoy extraordinary in Japan and now in China. The chief contents of the book is a journal of Saris's voyage from Bantam to Japan in 1613 and of his stay in Japan, printed from the manuscript in the India Office Records. It also contains a trade report of his, written during his residence at Bantam, 1605-1609, a letter which he wrote at the Cape on his return, and his final report to the East India Company, written at Plymouth.

Dr. Hans Schlitter, archivist at Vienna, after publishing many of the necessary documents in his *Briefe und Denkschriften zur Vorgeschichte der belgischen Revolution* (Vienna, Holzhausen, pp. 125), has now brought out through the same house the first part of a highly important work on *Die Regierung Josefs II. in den österreichischen Niederlanden*. The present part extends to the recall of Count Murray (pp. 298).

Dr. Hermann Hüffer, in his series of *Quellen zur Geschichte des Zeitalters der französischen Revolution*, derived from various Viennese archives, has published the first part of a volume of documents on the battle of Marengo and the Italian campaign of 1800 (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner).

Perhaps no more important contribution to the diplomatic history of the Napoleonic period has appeared during the past year than Professor August Fournier's *Der Kongress von Chatillon; Die Politik im Kriege von 1814* (Vienna and Prag, Tempsky, pp. 397), based on extensive archive studies in several countries.

The November number of the *Revue Historique* contains a summary review of the Rumanian historical publications of the years 1894-98, by D. A. Teodoru and A. D. Xenopol, continued from the preceding number and concluded.

Messrs. Gibbings and Co. will publish a new edition of *A Short History of China*, by Demetrius Charles Boulger, containing an additional chapter upon the history from 1890 to the present time, by a writer whose name is not stated.

Methuen and Co. publish a careful handbook on China, by Mr. J. Robertson-Scott, entitled *The People of China: Their Country, History, Life, Ideas, and Relations to the Foreigner*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. Saglio, *L'Agonie des Ming; Épisode de l'Histoire de Chine* (*Revue Historique*, September); K. T. Heigel, *Zur Geschichte des Rastatter Gesandtenmordes am 28. April 1799* (*Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, III. 4); L. Thouvenel, *La Question Romaine en 1862* (*Revue de Paris*, July 1).

GREAT BRITAIN.

The council of the Royal Historical Society have issued a circular calling attention to the desirability of forming a School of Advanced Historical Studies in London, in order to provide systematic instruction in

the investigation of historical materials. The curriculum suggested would provide courses in methodology, palaeography and diplomatics, the bibliography of printed and manuscript sources, and would also include archaeology, epigraphy, and numismatics. The council proposes the formation of a general committee to consider the project.

The British Government has published *Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward III., 1337-1339*; *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian)*, Vol. X., 1603-1607; *Calendar of Treasury Books and Papers, 1735-1738*; a report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, on the Manuscripts of Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, and Vol. 88 (1895-1896) of the *British and Foreign State Papers*.

The Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts has published a third volume (pp. li, 710) of its calendar of the papers of Mr. J. B. Fortescue of Dropmore, edited by Mr. Walter FitzPatrick, with a preface for both Vol. II. and Vol. III. The main text of the volume covers the years 1795, 1796 and 1797. But many earlier papers, 1787-1796, have been discovered at Dropmore since Vol. II. was printed, and these are now incorporated in an appendix. Taken as a whole the book is a highly important contribution to the history of the diplomacy of England under Grenville.

Messrs. Longmans announce for early publication Vol. III. (1654-1656) of Dr. S. R. Gardiner's *History of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate*; and *The Sources and Literature of English History, to 1485*, by Professor Charles Gross, of Harvard; and *A Critical Examination of Irish History*, by T. Dunbar Ingram.

The *Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds in the Public Record Office*, of which the first volume was published in 1890, has now reached its third (Eyre and Spottiswoode, Rolls Series), which, beside continuing those in the treasury of the receipt of the exchequer, court of augmentations and court of chancery, gives others from the queen's remembrancer's department of the exchequer. Fifteen thousand deeds have now been catalogued.

The Pipe Roll Society has published *The Feet of Fines of the Tenth Year of the Reign of Richard I.*, and, announcing that its funds are exhausted, and that it will publish nothing more, has dissolved.

Messrs. Archibald Constable and Co. will publish a new edition of *The Paston letters, 1422-1509*, in which the separate prefaces and introductions to the three volumes by the editor, Mr. James Gairdner, will be superseded by a general preface and a general introduction in a volume by itself. This volume will also contain a supplement, in which the Roydon Hall letters will be printed from the original MSS. now in the British Museum, with a few other originals hitherto unedited.

Students of the history of the Pilgrim Fathers will be glad to know of the publication (London, J. Clarke) of Mr. F. J. Powicke's *Henry*

Barrowe, Separatist (1550 ?-1593) and the Exiled Church of Amsterdam (1593-1622), pp. 412.

It is announced that the next volume in the well-known "Goupil" series will be a memoir of Queen Anne, whose reign surely supplies abundant material for that lavish display of illustration which forms one of the greatest attractions of the Goupil series.

Mr. David Nutt publishes *The Rising of 1745; with a Bibliography of Jacobite History*, 1689-1788, by Charles Sanford Terry, M.A. This is the third volume in the series, "Scottish History from Contemporary Writers." The appendix contains a good bibliography of Jacobite history. A letter written by Charles Edward to Cluny Macpherson when on board *L'Heureux*, September 20, 1746, is reproduced.

A new edition of Gibbon's *Memoirs*, edited by Dr. Birkbeck Hill, is to be published in England by Methuen, and in the United States by Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

A new edition of the *Letters of Horace Walpole* is in preparation by Mrs. Paget Toynbee, for the Clarendon Press. It will consist of ten or eleven octavo volumes, and will be provided with a full index.

The *Life and Correspondence of the Rt. Hon. Hugh Culling Eardley Childers*, by his son, Lieut.-Colonel Spencer Childers, will soon be published by John Murray, who also has in press *The Autobiography of Lt.-General Sir Harry Smith, Bart., of Aliwal, G. C. B.*, edited by Mr. G. C. Moore Smith.

Messrs. Blackwood and Sons will shortly issue a volume of reminiscences by the late "Father of the House of Commons," Sir John Mowbray, Bart. It is entitled *Seventy Years at Westminster*. Sir John was a member of Lord Derby's government in 1858. The book will contain his articles which appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine*, supplemented by letters and notes, edited by his daughter.

The *Life and Letters of Thomas Huxley*, by his son, Leonard Huxley, is just published by D. Appleton and Co. The narrative is made up in great part of Huxley's letters. There are several appendixes.

Messrs. Longmans and Co. announce the second volume of Sir William Hunter's *History of British India*, which takes up the narrative at the overthrow of the English in the Spice Archipelago in 1623, and carries it up to the time of the Union of the old and new Companies in 1708. Sir William's death left the ninth chapter uncompleted; and his outline of this has been filled in by other hands.

Captain A. T. Mahan's *The War in South Africa* (New York, Peter Fenelon Collier and Son) covers the operations of the earlier days in Natal, the contest in Cape Colony and the southern Free State, and practically ends with the occupation of Bloemfontein by the British. Subsequent events are dismissed in brief paragraphs. Sir John G. Bourinot has written an introduction. The book is elaborately illustrated.

Ladysmith: The Diary of a Siege, by H. W. Nevinston (New York, New Amsterdam Book Co.), appeared originally in the form of letters to the London *Daily Chronicle*, for which Mr. Nevinston acted as special correspondent. Besides dealing with the 118 days' siege of Ladysmith, the book contains accounts of the engagements immediately preceding.

Messrs. William Blackwood and Sons announce *A History of Rhodesia, compiled from Official Sources*, by Howard Hensman. The book was planned and the greater part written before the Boer war, but chapters dealing with the sieges of Kimberley and Mafeking, and the movements of Colonel Plumer's Rhodesian force, have been added.

The Story of Egypt, by W. Basil Worsfold ("Story of the Empire Series," London, Horace Marshall and Son), not only deals with the history of the country, but has supplementary chapters upon justice, education, and industrial progress in the Sudan.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. H. Round, *Colchester and the Commonwealth* (English Historical Review, October); B. Williams, *The Foreign Policy of England under Walpole*, III. (ibid.); A. T. Mahan, *Nelson at Naples* (ibid.).

FRANCE.

We call attention again to the *Bibliothèque des Bibliographies Critiques* which the Société des Études Historiques is publishing. These useful pamphlets range in size from seven or eight pages ("La Prise de la Bastille") to twenty-seven ("Histoire de l'Industrie en France avant 1789" and "La Guerre de 1870-1871") or more. Ten have been published already. Among those promised are lists for each period of French history, for many of the provinces and towns of France, etc.

M. Félix Alcan announces a new volume in the *Recueil des Instructions données aux Ambassadeurs*, namely, a volume for Prussia, by M. A. Waddington; and Vol. IV. of M. Zévort's *Histoire de la Troisième République*, dealing with the period of President Carnot.

Professor Imbart de la Tour of Bordeaux has reprinted in a volume (Paris, Picard) the excellent series of articles on *Les Paroisses Rurales du IV^e au XI^e Siècle* which he contributed to the *Revue Historique* in 1896-1898.

Vol. XLVIII. of the *Bulletin de la Société Archéologique du Limousin* consists of two cartularies, edited by M. de Senneville, the one belonging to the priory of Aureil, the other to that of L'Artige, and both presenting many features of interest. A cartulary of a rarer type, that of a lay seignior, that of the Sires de Rays, edited by M. René Blanchard, is completed by the publication of its second volume, as Vol. XXX. of the *Archives Historiques du Poitou*.

Two thorough and valuable monographs in the constitutional history of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are M. O. Morel's *La Grande*

Chancellerie Royale et l'Expédition des Lettres Royaux de l'Avènement de Philippe VI. à la Fin du XIV^e Siècle, published by the "Société de l'École des Chartes" (Paris, Picard), and M. E. Lameere's *Le Grand Conseil des Ducs de Bourgogne de la Maison de Valois* (Brussels, Castaigne). M. R. Genestal, in his *La Tenure en Bourgogne* (Paris, A. Rousseau), studies for Normandy the same problem of the legal status of urban property which M. Des Marez has illustrated so thoroughly in the case of Belgium.

It is announced that in the Cambridge Historical Series (University Press) there will shortly appear two volumes on *The French Monarchy, 1483-1789*, by Mr. A. J. Grant, professor of history in the Yorkshire College at Leeds.

Upon occasion of the Paris Exposition M. Henri Avenel has presented to the ministry of commerce a voluminous report entitled *Histoire de la Presse Française depuis 1789 jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris, Flammarion, pp. 892).

The sixth series of Baron Alberto Lumbroso's *Miscellanea Napoleonica* contains a large number of letters of Napoleon heretofore unprinted, some of them derived from the proof-sheets of the *Correspondance de Napoléon I.*, from which they were ultimately dropped.

The volume on Napoleon (London, A. L. Humphreys) upon which Lord Rosebery has long been at work, is especially concerned with Napoleon's residence at St. Helena. The book is published in the United States by Harper and Brothers, and is entitled *Napoleon: The Last Phase*.

Souvenirs Contemporains, by the Marquis de Belleval (Paris, Vivien, pp. 432) is an amusing and interesting book, having especial value for its description of the entourage of the Comte de Chambord.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: B. de Mandrot, *L'Autorité Historique de Philippe de Commines*, II. (Revue Historique, September); V. L. Bourrilly, *François I. et les Protestants; Les Essais de Concorde en 1535*, I. (Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, 1900, 7); Abbé Feret, *L'Université de Paris et les Jésuites au Commencement du XVII^e Siècle* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); F. T. Perrens, *Le Premier Abbé Dubois*, I. (Revue Historique, November); G. Fagniez, *L'Opinion Publique et la Presse Politique sous Louis XIII.*, 1624-1626 (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, 1900, 3); *Correspondance Intime du Général Jean Hardy, 1797-1802, Expéditions d'Irlande et de St. Domingue* (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 1); G. Caudrillier, *Le Complot de l'an XII.*, I. (Revue Historique, November); G. de Grandmaison, *Talleyrand et les Affaires d'Espagne en 1808* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); L. G. Pélissier, *La Trahison de Masséna* (Revue Historique, September).

ITALY, SPAIN.

Hoepli of Milan has undertaken to produce, in a series of volumes, a history of Italy, which shall be scientific in spirit while popular in form. The most recent of these volumes is *Le Invasione Barbariche in Italia*, by Professor Pasquale Villari, giving an account of the fall of the Western Empire, and proceeding to the coronation of Charlemagne in 800.

The Rulers of the South ; Sicily, Calabria, Malta, in two volumes, by F. Marion Crawford (The Macmillan Co.) is a companion work to the author's *Ave Roma Immortalis*, and deals in a similar manner with history and legends.

The *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria* contains an "Iter Italicum" of Arnold von Buchell, 1565-1645, a document of great interest for the topography of Rome in the sixteenth century, preserved at Utrecht. It bears date 1587. Dr. P. Fedele presents the first part of a series of documents of Santa Maria Nova, 982-1100. The documents of the monastery of San Silvestro de Capite, and those published by Tomassetti on the Campagna are continued. The society has in preparation an edition of the *Liber Hystoriarum Romanarum* and Vol. I. (Vols. II.-V. having already been published) of the *Regesto di Farfa*.

Part II. of Dr. R. Davidsohn's *Forschungen zur Geschichte von Florenz* (Berlin, Mittler, pp. 352) consists of a calendar, with some papers reproduced in full, of documents of San Gimignano dating from 1318 to 1341.

Dr. Max Immich's *Papst Innocenz XI., 1676-1689; Beiträge zur Geschichte seiner Politik und zur Charakteristik seiner Persönlichkeit* (Berlin, Speyer und Peters), continues his study of that pope's diplomacy, already mentioned in these pages, by an endeavor to account for his policy.

In the *Revue Historique* for September Don Rafael Altamira gives a summary review of Spanish historical publications, both books and articles, of the years 1897 and 1898.

Messrs. Lea Brothers and Co. (Philadelphia) will publish shortly *The Moriscos of Spain, Their Conversion and Expulsion*, by Henry Charles Lea, LL.D. The author has used documents from the Spanish archives, and purposes to give a connected account of the vicissitudes of this remarkable people.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals : J. Schnitzer, *Zur Geschichte der Sklaverei zu Florenz im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert* (Römische Quartalschrift, XIV. 1-2); J. Schnitzer, *Zur Geschichte Alexanders VI.* (Historisches Jahrbuch, 1900, 1); *Sulla Via de Roma ; Da Aspromonte a Mentana ; Documenti Inediti* (Nuova Antologia, June 15); H. Léonardon, *Prim et la Candidature Hohenzollern* (Revue Historique, November); A. R. Whiteway, *Customs of the Western Pyrenees* (English Historical Review, October).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND.

Beginning with the new year, Mr. Felix Dietrich (Leipzig) will issue annual volumes of a *Bibliographie der deutschen Recensionen*, edited by Mr. L. Jellinek as a supplement to the *Bibliographie der Zeitschriften-Literatur*. The purpose is to furnish a list of book-reviews that have appeared during the year in about a thousand scientific and technical journals of Germany.

In the *Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXVI. 3, Professor Georg von Below prints a long article on theories of the economic development of nations, with especial reference to the economics of German cities in the Middle Ages. The plans of the Prussian patriots for a rising in the summer of 1808 are illustrated by some unprinted memorials of Gneisenau and Scharnhorst. A considerable portion of Gneisenau's correspondence has lately been published at the instance of his present representatives under the title *Aus der Zeit der Noth, 1806 bis 1815, Schilderungen der preussischen Geschichte* (Berlin, Mittler, pp. 390).

The Historical Commission of the Bavarian Academy intends shortly to bring out the first volume of the correspondence of Conrad Celtis, the third of that of the elector Johann Casimir, the third of the chronicles of Lübeck (continuations of Detmar and Rufus), the writings of Andreas of Ratisbon, and the chronicle of Ulrich Fueterer.

Among the announcements for the *Leipziger Studien aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte* we notice a treatise by Dr. Hashagen on "Otto von Freising als Geschichtsphilosoph und Kirchenpolitiker."

Professor Aloys Schulte of Breslau has brought out, in two volumes (Leipzig, Duncker and Humblot, pp. 742, 358) a *Geschichte des mittelalterlichen Handels und Verkehrs zwischen Westdeutschland und Italien, mit Ausschluss von Venedig*. The second volume consists of documents, 451 in number. This is one of the publications planned by the Historical Commission of Baden.

Vol. II. of the new series of *Hansische Geschichtsquellen* is devoted to *Die Lübecker Bergenfahrer und ihre Chronistik*, set forth by Dr. Friedrich Bruns.

In Steinhausen's *Monographien zur deutschen Kulturgeschichte*, No. 6 is a treatise on *Der Bauer in der deutschen Vergangenheit* (Leipzig, Diederichs, pp. 143), with 168 illustrations derived from originals of the fifteenth and subsequent centuries.

Vol. LXXV. of the *Publikationen aus den k. preussischen Staatsarchiven*, edited by Paul Bailleu, is a collection of the correspondence of Frederick William III. and Queen Louise with the Czar Alexander I.

Messrs. Harper and Brothers have in preparation a translation of Bismarck's letters to his wife, which extend from a date some years prior to 1847, the date of his marriage, to 1892.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Kohfeldt, *Zur Geschichte der Büchersammlungen und des Bücherbesitzes in Deutschland* (Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte, VII. 5-6); J. von Pflugk-Harttung, *Ludwig der Baier in seinem Streite mit der römischen Kurie* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XXI. 2); M. Laux, *Ueber den Ursprung der Landsknechte* (Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte, VIII. 1); W. Clasen, *Die Politik der schweizerischen Bauer zur Zeit Zwinglis* (Zeitschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Ergänzungsheft 4).

AMERICA.

On October 3, the centennial anniversary of the birth of George Bancroft was celebrated at Worcester, Mass., by the Worcester Society of Antiquity and other organizations. A stone block with a bronze tablet marking the site of his birthplace was dedicated. An address was delivered by Gen. James Grant Wilson of New York. This, and the other proceedings, will be printed in the *Proceedings* of the society named.

Mr. J. N. Larned's *Annotated Bibliography of American History* is now in the press.

The Council of the American Antiquarian Society has appropriated money for the preparation and eventual publication of a systematic and detailed Guide to the Materials for American History to be found in the Public Record Office and other public repositories in London—an important enterprise. Students who have worked among the American papers of the Public Record Office and the British Museum are invited to send suggestions as to the details of such a guide to the managing editor of this journal.

In the *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* at its meeting of April 25, 1900 (XIII. 3), Mr. S. S. Green gives a full and interesting history of the Craigie House at Cambridge; Dr. Alexander Graham Bell a paper on Francis Green and early efforts toward the instruction of the deaf in America; Mr. George E. Francis on the Tory Dr. William Paine; Mr. G. P. Winship on John and Sebastian Cabot; Dr. C. L. Nichols on Isaiah Thomas; and Mr. Lucien Carr on the Mascoutins. Mr. R. N. Toppan completes his print of the records of Andros and his council.

No. 7 of the *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, Eighteenth Series, is an essay on the Constitution and Admission of Iowa into the Union, by Professor James Alton James of Northwestern University. An introductory study was published by Professor James in the *Report of the American Historical Association* for 1897. In Nos. 8-9 Dr. Herbert B. Adams has published a study of the Church and Popular Education, investigating the workings of the churches as educational institutions, especially in Baltimore.

Messrs. D. Appleton and Co. have published *The Transit of Civilization from England to America in the Seventeenth Century*, by Dr. Edward

Eggleston,—a continuation of his work on American history of which the first volume, *Beginners of the Nation*, appeared some years ago.

The Century Company has published *Colonial Days and Ways*, by Miss Helen Evertsen Smith, a book descriptive of colonial manners and customs, and based upon the large accumulation of family letters at the Smith homestead in Sharon, Conn. The conditions of life in the early Dutch, Huguenot and New England towns are included in the subject of the volume.

Messrs. Goupil have issued, in their sumptuous series of illustrated biographical books, a handsome volume on *George Washington*, by Mr. Worthington C. Ford.

The *Catalogue of the Washington Collection* in the Boston Athenaeum was originally published without an index. This omission has now been repaired by the printing of such an *Index* (pp. 85), prepared by Mr. Franklin Osborne Poole.

Mr. Joseph Smolinski of Washington, a Polish American, has for some time occupied himself with the patriotic endeavor to collect the unpublished letters of Pulaski and Kosciuszko relating to the American Revolution. He has now begun to publish the results, in exact transcripts, in the Polish American magazine *Sztandar*, of Chicago. The letters so far printed are English or French letters of Pulaski to the Continental Congress or to General Washington, with Polish translations. The series began in the March number. The undertaking is an interesting and praiseworthy one, and deserves encouragement. We hope that possessors of letters of either of these two Polish heroes will communicate with Mr. Smolinski, whose address is 721 Eleventh Street, N. W., Washington.

As an "advance separate" from the *Report of the American Historical Association* for 1899 we have received a pamphlet by Dr. O. G. Libby of the University of Wisconsin, "A Critical Examination of Gordon's History of the American Revolution," in which he proves Gordon's extreme "indebtedness" to the *Annual Register*.

A second edition of Mrs. Elizabeth Ellet's *The Women of the American Revolution*, which first appeared in the middle of the century, is published by G. W. Jacobs and Co. (Philadelphia), edited by Miss Anne Hollingsworth Wharton.

In the thirty-ninth volume of the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Mr. J. G. Rosengarten has a paper on American history from German archives, with a list of Hessian diaries, and a reprint of Mirabeau's *Avis aux Hessois*.

Part 2 of Professor H. V. Ames's *State Documents on Federal Relations* (Department of History, University of Pennsylvania) contains a large number of interesting documents upon this important subject. They extend from 1809 to 1815, centering chiefly around the Olmstead case, the militia question in the war of 1812 and the Hartford Convention.

Most of them are hard to procure, and their collection, with excellent notes, is a most praiseworthy achievement.

Macmillan and Co. have taken over from Harper and Brothers the publication of Dr. James Ford Rhodes's *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850*, of which a new edition will be published at once.

The Bureau of Education has published a preliminary bibliography of *Confederate Text-books*, compiled by Dr. Stephen B. Weeks. Additions to the list are solicited.

Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons have published a new edition of McCulloch's *Men and Measures of Half a Century*, and have thus put before the public a smaller, less expensive, and more satisfactory, because less unwieldy, volume than was the first edition of this well-known work.

The President's *Message transmitting the Treaty of Peace with Spain* (Fifty-fifth Congress, third session, Senate Document No. 62, Part 1). contains beside the treaty and the protocols of the negotiations much correspondence of the American consuls in the Philippines with Aguinaldo and others, as well as with the State Department.

The Prince Society has in preparation a volume upon Samuel Maverick, including his Description of New England, letters and other papers, and a memoir by Mr. Frank W. Hackett. They also announce volumes upon Sir Humphrey Gilbert, with a memoir by Rev. Carlos Slafter, and the letters of Governor Hutchinson and Lieut.-Governor Oliver, 1768-1769, edited by Mr. Thornton K. Lothrop.

The Massachusetts Historical Society has lately acquired the mass of correspondence which was accumulated by the late W. W. Story, when preparing the *Life and Letters of Joseph Story*. It includes many interesting letters of Marshall, Story, Webster and others.

The Preston and Rounds Co. (Providence) will publish a *Civil and Military List of Rhode Island*, from 1647 to 1800, compiled from the records by Mr. Joseph J. Smith. The civil list will include sheriffs, justices, colonial agents, clerks of courts, and many minor officials, down to ferrymen.

The October *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* contains some interesting letters of Lowell, 1843-1854. That of November contains an elaborate list of references to documents, etc., relating to the boundaries of the State of New York. The *Calendar of the Emmet Collection* has been drawn off from the pages of the *Bulletin* into a volume of which a few copies are for sale.

The state of New York has issued a second edition of *New York in the Revolution as Colony and State* (pp. 534) with the imprint 1898. Compiled from records found, arranged and classified by Comptroller Roberts, the volume contains lists of names of members of military organizations, some fifty-two thousand in all, with an index filling half the pages.

The *State Library Bulletin*, History No. 4 (University of the State of New York) is an historical sketch of Slavery in New York, by Judge A. Judd Northrup.

Rev. Dr. Walton M. Battershall has written *A History of St. Peter's Church in the City of Albany* (Albany, Fort Orange Press, Brandow Printing Co.). St. Peter's is described in the introduction as a centre of English missionary work among the Iroquois, while its records furnish material for the colonial and the post-revolutionary period.

Beside pieces continued from the last number, the October issue of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History* contains Colonel Elias Boudinot's notes of two conferences held by the American and British commissioners to settle a general cartel for the exchange of prisoners of war in 1778, Du Coudray's observations (July, 1777) on the forts intended for the defense of the two passages of the River Delaware, and a facsimile of a number of the first German newspaper published in Pennsylvania. This was the *Philadelphische Zeitung*, of which Franklin printed a few numbers in 1732, but of which no copy had ever been discovered till lately. Upon the miscellaneous letters and brief documents which form so rich a portion of the contents of this journal we seldom have space to comment. In the present number we notice two letters of Jasper Yeates advocating the selection of Lancaster as the federal capital in 1789, and one of Samuel Wharton, 1775, urging his brother Thomas to take several members of Congress into partnership in the "Indiana" grant if necessary, in order to secure a validation of that grant by Congress.

Mr. F. R. Diffenderffer has published (New Era Printing Co., Lancaster, Penn.) *The German Immigration into Pennsylvania through the Port of Philadelphia, 1700-1775*. Mr. Diffenderffer published several years ago a monograph entitled *The German Exodus to England*.

Mr. Aksel G. S. Josephson, of the John Crerar Library, Chicago, has in preparation a bibliography of New Sweden.

The September *Publications* of the Southern History Association contains the concluding portion of the journal of Thomas Nicholson, the Quaker preacher, and an account of the Society of the Cincinnati in Virginia.

The October number of the *Virginia Magazine of History* contains much interesting matter. Of a dozen letters of Jefferson here printed, those to Richard Henry Lee are of considerable interest. The installment of Nicholson papers includes, among others, some which describe a barring-out at the College of William and Mary in 1702. The Sainsbury abstracts relate chiefly to the foundation of Maryland. The editor prints some interesting papers gleaned in a tour among the old county court-houses; one of them shows the noted John Saffin selling a Spanish mulatto named Antonio to Ralph Wormeley of Virginia, to be free at the end of ten years.

In the *Lower Norfolk County Virginia Antiquary*, Vol. III., Parts 2, 3, the interesting autobiography of Mrs. Read is concluded; the papers on Grace Sherwood and the Church in Lower Norfolk County and the lists of property-owners of Norfolk County in 1860 and of owners of land and slaves in Princess Anne in 1860 are continued.

The *Randolph-Macon Monthly* for October has a series of letters, hitherto unpublished, relating to the presidential election of 1800, and written in response to the request of Col. Leven Powell, representative from Virginia, by his friends and constituents. They are edited by Professor William E. Dodd.

Dr. Stephen B. Weeks, author of a *Historical Bibliography of North Carolina* published by the Library of Harvard University, will shortly publish a more comprehensive *Bibliography of North Carolina*, embracing all important publications by or concerning North Carolinians or North Carolina.

No. 1 of the *James Sprunt Historical Monographs* (The University of North Carolina Publications) contains an account of the "Personnel of the Convention of 1861," by Mr. John G. McCormick, and of the "Legislation of the Convention of 1861," by Dr. Kemp P. Battle.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* for July continues its account of the Middleton family, for its genealogical section. In the historical portion, the papers of the first Council of Safety and those of the mission of Col. John Laurens to Europe in 1781 are continued. The editor also prints some interesting letters of Justice William Johnson to Jefferson, supplementing the Jefferson letters heretofore printed by him, and the first rules of the St. Cecilia Society, 1773. The October number, besides continuations, deals with the Colleton family.

A Chapter of South Carolina Constitutional History, by David D. Wallace, Ph.D. (Publications of the Vanderbilt Southern History Society, No. 4) deals with the importation of tea into Charleston, in 1773, the refusal by the citizens to allow it to be sold, and the methods of organizing public and political activity that grew out of concerted action upon this juncture and similar occasions. Mr. Wallace points out, incidentally, that the tea landed at Charleston did not "rot in cellars," as was long stated, but was stored for three years, and then confiscated and sold to defray public expenses.

Students of Alabama history may be interested in learning that the letter-book of the adjutant-general's office of the state of Alabama, containing copies of correspondence from January 11, 1861, to July 9, 1863, is now at the adjutant-general's office of the state of Missouri. The correspondent who sends this information says that nothing is known of the history of the book, but that it probably fell into the hands of Missouri troops at the close of the war and was by them carried to Jefferson City.

The October number of the *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* contains four articles of much interest: an eye-witness account of the escape of Karnes and Teal, the Texan commissioners, from Matamoros; reminiscences of Mrs. Dilue Harris, a pioneer, 1833-1836; an article by Mr. Leopold Morris on the Mexican raid of 1875 on Corpus Christi; and one by Mr. Alexander Dienst on New Orleans newspaper files of the period of the Texan revolution.

A correspondent calls our attention to the publication at Seville (D. Vicente Llorens Asensio, calle Garcia di Vimiese 26) of a *Relacion Descriptiva de los Mapas planos di Mexico y Floridas existentes en el Archivo General de Indias*, Vol. I. (pp. 223), by Señor Pedro Torres Lanzas, chief archivist. There are 319 items described, ranging in date from 1519 to 1776. With many maps are included plans of buildings, etc.

The Indiana Historical Society has issued (*Publications*, Vol. III., No. III.) the *Executive Journal of Indiana Territory*, 1800-1816, edited with careful annotations by Messrs. William W. Wollen, Daniel W. Howe, and Jacob P. Dunn.

The Story of John Adams by M. E. B. and H. G. B. (Scribners) gives the record of his life as principal of the Phillips Academy, at Andover, and as a pioneer settler in Illinois, where he labored actively as a missionary for twelve years, establishing, it is said, three hundred and twenty-two Sunday-schools.

The McLean County Historical Society of Bloomington, Illinois, has since its organization in 1892 issued three volumes of *Transactions*. Volume I. contains the "War Record of McLean County;" Volume II. the "School Record;" and recently a third volume has appeared with an account of the first Republican convention in Illinois. This took place in Bloomington, May 29, 1856, and was summoned by the "Anti-Nebraska" newspaper editors of the state. On May 29, 1900, it was commemorated by the Historical Society, with addresses by the surviving members. The volume contains the official report of the convention, the addresses just mentioned, and a biography of Governor Bissel, who owed his nomination to this convention.

The dedication of the new Library Building of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, at Madison, took place October 19. The principal address was that by Mr. Charles Francis Adams, which appears as the first article in the current number of the REVIEW. Addresses were also given by the president of the society, Hon. John Johnston, the secretary, Mr. R. G. Thwaites, and Professor McLaughlin of Michigan.

The forty-eighth annual meeting of the Historical Society of Wisconsin was held on December 13, in the new library and museum building. The library is reported as now amounting to 215,606 titles. Volume XV. of the *Collections* is just issued. It contains many documents relating to the formation of the Presbyterian and Methodist churches in Wisconsin, the diary of a New Glarus colonist, and an Indian agent's

report on the economic condition of Wisconsin in 1831, etc. A strong effort is being made to increase the appropriation for the purchase of books.

The July number of the *Annals of Iowa* contains an interesting body of Recollections of Gen. Nathaniel Lyon, by the late Dr. William A. Hammond. The series of articles on the old forts is continued by a short article on Fort Atkinson. The October number deals with Fort Dodge, and has a long article upon Stephen Whicher, a lawyer and early settler in Iowa, by Professor George M. Whicher of Adelphi College.

We note, without being able to resolve the seeming inconsistencies of the title, that there has been published in Zurich a volume of 318 pages entitled *Californien unmittelbar vor und nach der Entdeckung des Goldes : Bilder aus dem Leben des Heinrich Lienhard von Bilten, Kt. Glarus, in Nauvoo, Nord-Amerika*.

Messrs. Constable announce *The Fight with France for North America*, by A. G. Bradley. Beginning with the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle and the conditions and characteristics of the British American colonies and Canada in 1750, Mr. Bradley proceeds to a description of the struggle for expansion in North America. The book has excellent maps.

The Burrows Brothers Company announce a new and complete edition of Charlevoix's *The History and General Description of New France*, translated and edited by the late Dr. John Gilmary Shea, with a new memoir and bibliography of the translator by Noah Farnham Morrison, numerous steel portraits and facsimiles of ancient maps. The edition will be in six volumes and is limited to 750 copies.

Mr. Henry Harrisse has in press the *Découverte et Évolution Cartographique de Terre-Neuve et de la Région Adjacente*. This work will be similar in form to his *Discovery of North America*, and will be issued in a limited edition, by Stevens in London and by Welter in Paris.

In the series of studies published by the University of Toronto, the next historical monograph to appear is one on the Early Trading Companies of New France, by Mr. H. P. Biggar.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals : W. Wilson, *Colonies and Nation*, I. (Harper's Magazine, January) ; A. D. Morse, *The Significance of the Democratic Party* (International Monthly, October). G. S. Boutwell, *The Last of the Ocean Slave-Traders* (New England Magazine, November) ; J. Goode, *Recollections of the Confederate Congress* (Conservative Review, September).

The
American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION AT DETROIT AND ANN ARBOR

THE sixteenth annual meeting of the American Historical Association was held on December 27, 28 and 29, the middle day being devoted to sessions at Ann Arbor, the rest of the time spent at Detroit. Perhaps no meeting has ever been so successful in the general promotion of mutual acquaintance. To a larger extent than usual the members were gathered under one roof. Nearly all the sessions were held under that same roof, the hotel having an adequate convention hall. Detroit itself, though handsome and attractive, and abundantly hospitable, did not present, to savants who being human are prone to wander, those distractions which are presented by larger cities; perhaps, indeed, a city of the second size, with a university near by, affords the best place for meetings of such an association. However this may be, certain it is that a large number of members were present, and found much pleasure in social intercourse with their fellow-members and with the members of the American Economic Association, which met at the same time and place, though with another hotel as its headquarters. It was noticeable that a large number of young men were present, whose obvious interest and serious devotion to their professional work were constantly gratifying. General and Mrs. Russell A. Alger received the members, with cordial hospitality, on the Thursday afternoon; "smokers" were given by the University Club and the Detroit Club in the evenings; and the ladies attending were entertained by Mrs. George O. Robinson. By the kindness of citizens of Michigan, a special train was provided which conveyed the members to and from Ann Arbor, where they were hospitably entertained to luncheon by President Angell and other members of the faculty of the University of Michigan. The university provided rooms for the sessions of Friday. That of Thursday evening, at which

the presiding officers of the two associations read their addresses, was held in the First Methodist Church of Detroit. That all the arrangements were carried out so smoothly, and resulted in so much pleasure to those who attended, is due to the faithful preparatory work of the local committee of arrangements, and primarily to its chairman, Professor Earle W. Dow, of the University of Michigan. It is more proper to record the obligations of the Association to him because he was not seen at any of the sessions, owing to illness largely caused by his devotion to this very task. For the skillful construction of the programme, composed of elements unusually varied yet so associated as to avoid all appearance of scrappiness, the Association is mainly indebted to the chairman of its committee on the programme, Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin of the same university, who was assisted in this work by Professors Robinson, Turner, E. G. Bourne and Judson, and Mr. A. Howard Clark.

The great success of the meeting was the more remarkable when it is remembered how many were ill of those upon whom the Association and the committee had relied as officers and speakers. The President, Dr. Edward Eggleston, was unexpectedly prevented by illness from appearing; and the Second Vice-President was then unable to take his place. The First Vice-President, Professor Moses Coit Tyler, died at Ithaca during the time of the sessions. Expressions of sorrow over his loss were frequent and genuine. Much of the best of his work had been done at Ann Arbor. He was one of the founders of the Association, one of its chief ornaments, and one who worthily filled the place of an elder brother in a profession still young in our country. Many of the members of the Association had had occasion to appreciate not only his learning, the grace of his style and the charm of his conversation, but his personal tact and friendly courtesy, and the kindness and warmth of his heart. Continued ill-health caused the resignation, at this meeting, of Professor Herbert B. Adams of Baltimore, Secretary of the Association from the time of its foundation in 1884. He had had a most important, and indeed probably the leading share in its organization, and had borne the principal part in the arrangement of its first eleven meetings. His constant and devoted services to the Association were gratefully noted in private, and publicly commemorated by a formal minute of the Association and by his election to the office of First Vice-President. Illness prevented two or three of the speakers from appearing, though in one case the paper was read by a friend. The duty of presiding was acceptably performed by two ex-presidents, Dr. James Ford

Rhodes and President James B. Angell of the University, and by Hon. Peter White, a member of the Council.

Aside from the business meeting, there were six sessions of the Association. One of these was devoted to the inaugural addresses; one was a joint session held with the American Economic Association. Of the remaining four, one was given to the history of the Crusades and of the East, one to the Church History Section, one to Western history, and one was divided between British history and that of the United States.

In the session devoted to the Crusades and the East, the first paper was one which Professor George L. Burr of Cornell University had been requested to prepare, on the Year One Thousand and the Antecedents of the First Crusade, in general review of the modern discussions and the present state of knowledge. This paper appears as the next article to this, in the present number of this REVIEW. After it, Professor Oliver J. Thatcher of the University of Chicago read a carefully prepared and instructive survey of the modern Critical Work on the Sources for the First Crusade. Beginning with Ranke's seminary of 1837 and Sybel's book of 1841, he traced the history of the discussion, and described the Latin sources of the first rank—the letters of the crusaders and the eye-witness accounts by the anonymous Italian, Raymond of Agiles, Fulcher of Chartres, and Tudebod—and those of the second rank, coming from writers who, like Ekkehard and Radulf, went out to the Holy Land soon after the date of this crusade. He then gave a brief account of the ways in which the modern process of shifting emphasis from the secondary to the primary sources has reconstituted our narrative of the First Crusade—the relegating of Peter the Hermit to the background, the exalting of Pope Urban, the partial discrediting of the leaders—and of the causes which had brought about the original distortion.

President Angell of the University of Michigan, formerly ambassador to Turkey, read the paper upon the Capitulations in Turkey which appeared in our last issue (pp. 254–259). In discussion of Dr. Thatcher's paper, Professor Archibald C. Coolidge of Harvard University dwelt especially upon the important relations of the Crusades to the Eastern Church and Empire and to Asiatic history in general, and upon the Byzantine sources for their history. Dr. Alfred L. P. Dennis, instructor at Harvard, by request described, both with respect to the Crusades and in more general aspects, the Oriental portion of the library of the late Count Riant. This half of his collections has been presented to the library of Harvard University, while the Scandinavian section has been presented to Yale.

The morning session ended with the appointment of the following committees by the chair: on finance, Hon. Elbridge T. Gerry and Mr. George S. Bowdoin; on audit, Messrs. Bryant Walker and Andrew McF. Davis; on nominations, Professors H. P. Judson, George L. Burr and Victor Coffin; on resolutions, Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, Professor James A. Woodburn and Professor John M. Vincent.

The public session of the Church History Section, presided over by its secretary, Rev. Dr. Samuel Macauley Jackson, was well attended. The first paper was by Professor George James Bayles, of Columbia University, and was entitled *American Ecclesiology*. His subject was not ecclesiology in the narrower sense of architectural antiquities, but in general that branch of social history which has to do with religion in America. The chief data were: a limited individual action for the purposes of religion, a limited co-operative action for the same, and a limited creation of corporation law. Throughout our history there had been an enlargement of the scope of individual and voluntary action in religion. Secondly, it seemed probable that the era of differentiation was coming to a close, and an era of absorption, consolidation and concentration opening. There had been a great growth of auxiliary organizations, with specialized functions; and many new forms of association had been evolved, such as federations of churches and other groupings. In the third respect, differentiating the concepts of the church, religious society, parish, and civil incorporation, he showed how the religious society, first, had been created by the civil power, and how, after the Revolution, great efforts were made to devise a good method whereby any religious body could receive incorporation. At the present time many laws recognize the organization and functionaries of churches, and give them authorization; while in some states there has been a tendency, likely to increase, toward the creation of corporations sole.

Professor Francis A. Christie of Meadville Theological Seminary, read an elaborate paper on the Date of the Ignatian Epistles. The date most often assigned to them has been about 110 A. D. The external (Eusebian) authority on which this date was grounded being regarded by the essayist as baseless, internal evidence must be relied on. He argued for a date during the reign of Hadrian. The chief heresy attacked in the epistles is the Doketic denial of the flesh of Christ and the consequent withdrawal from the Eucharist as celebrated by the parish bishop. The letters were demonstrably written before the Gnostic speculations were combated by means of the Logos doctrine, but at a time when Doketic

conceptions of Christ were becoming known in the churches of Syria and Asia Minor. Such views seem not to have been known in those regions until the appearance of Saturninus, Cerdon and Marcion, who cannot have been active before A. D. 130. Yet on the other hand the letters appear to have been written before Marcion's literary activity began.

The last paper, on the Origin of the Apostles' Creed, by Professor Arthur C. McGiffert of Union Theological Seminary, was in his absence read by Dr. Jackson. The writer found no earlier occurrence of the Apostles' Creed than in Gaul and Spain in the sixth century, but dealt with the origin of the old Roman Symbol from which it was derived, and which may be traced to the latter part of the second century. Some have thought that it was known in Rome when Marcion came, and to Justin, but Dr. McGiffert saw no evidence of its existence before Irenaeus, and dated it at about 150-175 A. D. Devised as a baptismal confession, and as necessary for protection against heresy, it bears evidence of its time in the nature of the errors, Docketic and Gnostic, against which its phrases are manifestly directed. Much of the paper was given to an analysis of these phrases, conducted from this point of view.

The evening session, as has already been mentioned, was given, after an address of welcome by Mayor Maybury of Detroit, to the inaugural address of Professor Richard T. Ely, President of the American Economic Association, and to a similar address by Dr. James Ford Rhodes, substituted for that which had been expected from Dr. Edward Eggleston as President of the American Historical Association. Dr. Ely chose as his subject "Competition, its Nature, Permanency and Beneficence." He dwelt on the development of competition through successive stages of economic life, pointing out how, originally cruel, it had constantly risen in plane during the progress of social evolution, so that slaughter, slavery, child-labor, and many unwholesome and oppressive practices once inseparable from competition had been successively ruled out. He dwelt also upon the thought that social evolution among men brought into being, along with competition, the growing enlargement of the associated competitive group; and the larger the competitive group, the greater the scope of sympathy, benevolence and public authority. Through the selective process of competition, a permanent element of human society, we have the survival of the fit; but it is for society to create such economic conditions that only desirable social qualities shall constitute eminent fitness for survival. The beneficence of the competitive order depends on the reconciliation of the effort to secure equality of opportunity to individuals and the maintenance

and development of those great economic institutions, such as private property and inheritance, which, though they limit competition, are justly regarded as among the principal achievements and possessions of our race.

Mr. Rhodes spoke upon the Writing of History. One should make sure of having, either in respect to manner or in respect to facts, something new to say. Historical originality may lie, to mention one particular, in the employment of some class of sources open to everyone but not heretofore used. A significant case of this in American history is the use which Dr. von Holst made of newspaper material. In the years just before the Civil War facts are to be found in the newspapers which were nowhere else set down. Dr. von Holst had appreciated this, had read them extensively, and used them with pertinence and effect, where previous writers had been prone to avoid them because of their inaccuracy and their mass. After touching upon the larger questions of style and of the mastery of facts, Mr. Rhodes discussed the subject of footnotes. Admitting that a mass of them was cumbrous and distracted the average reader from the narrative, he dwelt upon the profit which the historian derived from being held, or holding himself, to a strict responsibility for his statements through the necessity of supporting them by exact references. Their use was especially valuable in keeping the writer from hasty or strained or imperfect generalizations. Finally, the qualities of some of the great ancient and modern historians were passed in review, with several interesting suggestions as to methods of preparation and composition.

At Ann Arbor, on Friday morning, President Angell opened the joint session of the two associations with an address of welcome marked by his usual felicity. The first paper, by Professor Paul S. Reinsch of the University of Wisconsin, on French Experiments with Political Assimilation in the West Indies, is that which we are so fortunate as to be permitted to present in this number of the REVIEW. In Dr. Reinsch's absence it was read by his colleague, Professor Haskins. Professor H. Morse Stephens of Cornell University then spoke informally on the Turning Points in the History of British Administration in India. He first described the situation in the period between the virtual cession of Bengal and the arrival of Warren Hastings, during which the Company and the government of Great Britain alike refused to recognize responsibility for administration. Hastings resolved, as far as was possible, to put the Company into the position which had been occupied by the Emperor in respect to the administration of the

imperial provinces; and from 1772 to 1828 the general system was one which recognized the native practices and declined to interfere with them. The years from 1828 to 1857, from Lord William Bentinck to the Mutiny, were marked by a definite and conscious tendency, on the part of the paramount power, to introduce regulations conceived from the point of view of England, for instance by the abolition of suttee and thuggee, the introduction of the official use of the English language, and Lord Dalhousie's policy of annexation. The result was disaffection, shown at the time of the Mutiny. From 1858 to 1872 was a period of reconstruction, marked by great increase of efficiency. Native rights were more respected, and the integrity of the native states conserved. At the same time there was much administrative centralization. The period since Lord Mayo's rule, 1872-1900, has been marked by administrative decentralization and especially the completer organization of the eight great provinces. The main lesson of Indian history is the necessity of studying the subject populations as they actually are.

Dr. J. H. Hollander, the Treasurer of Porto Rico, who was to have discoursed upon the finances of the island, was unable to be present. Professor John H. Finley of Princeton, upon the basis of a recent and extensive walking-tour, described the general conditions of Porto Rico, and discussed the resulting financial difficulties which Dr. Hollander had encountered. He also discussed the code which the first commission had provided, and the better plans of the new commission. He believed that projects of administrative reform should begin with the municipalities, and that a form of general government more nearly approaching that of our territories might well be substituted for that which has lately been established.

In the discussion which followed, Professor Henry E. Bourne, of Western Reserve University, emphasized the local quality in our colonial problems. It was possible to study the Porto Rican problem with relation either to our institutions, or to the origin of the Porto Rico bill, or to the Philippine question; or to study the problems of each of our colonies with reference to local conditions and the experience of European nations. Professor Charles H. Hull of Cornell University set forth with great clearness the fiscal system of Porto Rico as it existed in the year 1897-1898, the effects which were necessarily involved in the transfer of sovereignty, those which actually resulted, and the plans made necessary for the future.

In the afternoon, at the session devoted to Western history, Professor Edward G. Bourne of Yale University read portions of that paper on the Legend of Marcus Whitman, which we had the

pleasure of printing in our January issue. He illustrated the vogue of the legend in an amusing way by showing that, in the recent voting for the Hall of Fame, Whitman received more votes than Senator Benton, Chief-Justice Chase or General Scott, and the same number as President Monroe. Then Mr. William I. Marshall of Chicago assailed the legend with much warmth, declaring that he had contended against it ever since 1888. He asserted that it first appeared in the *Pacific*, the organ of the California Congregationalists, in the issue for November 9, 1865, in an article by Rev. Mr. Spalding. He also made quotations from letters of Whitman and his wife, written during the year between the arrival of the Canadian immigrants and the beginning of his famous ride, and tending to show the motives for the latter. Mr. Marshall described his determined efforts to procure the elimination of the Whitman story from school text-books of history, even going so far as to read private letters received from the writers of such books. He was followed by Mr. Ripley Hitchcock of New York, who admitted that he had originally countenanced the story, but on examination was forced to give it up as Dr. Elliott Coues had also felt obliged to do. Mr. Hitchcock gave great credit to Mrs. Victor for her pioneer investigation, and concluded by pointing out some elements of the situation, in the Northwest and in American diplomacy, inconsistent with the legend.

The second of these papers in Western history was by Professor Samuel B. Harding of Indiana State University, and related to the Party Struggles in Missouri from 1861 to 1865. He described the contest of 1861 over the question of union or disunion, the varieties of party opinion then existing, the struggle of the unconditional-Union men against Governor Jackson, the actions of the convention, and the course of Captain Lyon, which, however effective in a military sense, he declared to have been politically a mistake. From the death of Lyon and the establishment of martial law, the opposition to secession passed into the hands of the military. The writer then turned to the other contest, that respecting slavery, and traced it from Gratz Brown's speech of 1858, but especially from 1861, through the period of radical supremacy made evident in the convention of 1863, and so to the convention of 1865 which abolished slavery. A new period then began, because of the disfranchising clause and the disabilities inherited from the Civil War. The narrative was continued to the election of Gratz Brown in 1870 and the end of the sway of the radicals.

Professor Frank H. Hodder of the University of Kansas then read a paper on An Omitted Chapter in the History of the Second

Missouri Compromise. The resolution of March 2, 1821, for the admission of Missouri, provides "that the fourth clause of the twenty-sixth section of the third article of the constitution" of Missouri shall never be so construed as to permit the passing of an act depriving citizens of other states of any of their privileges under the Federal Constitution. Now the clause against which the opponents of slavery were contending, and against which this phrase of the resolution has been assumed to have been directed, is not the one thus numerically designated. Art. III., Sec. 26, consists of three unnumbered portions, the first prohibitory upon the legislature, and consisting of two clauses, the second permissive, in four clauses, the third mandatory, in two clauses. It is the first clause of this third portion that enjoins the general assembly to pass a law to prevent the immigration of free negroes. Eustis's resolution provided that "the clause forbidding free negroes" to enter the state should be withdrawn. The misleading designation first appears in a resolution offered in the House by S. Moore of Pennsylvania on February 2. Mr. Hodder traced its history through the contest over Clay's and Roberts's resolutions and Clay's joint committee to the final vote, in which the existing form was carried by a change of votes on the part of Moore and two other Pennsylvanian members and one from North Carolina. He expressed suspicions of deliberate misdescription, and made some effort to trace it to its source. The session was closed by remarks by Professor Macy of Iowa College, on the relations of Western history to general history, and on the points of comparison between westward migration in the Old World and that from the Old World to the New and to the West.

The last of the sessions devoted to papers, that of Saturday morning, was marked by one informal address in English history and one in the most recent period of American history, with ensuing discussion. Illness detained the other speakers. Professor Wilbur C. Abbott of Dartmouth described the results of an investigation into the history of the opposition in Parliament during the time of the American War, and especially in the Parliament of 1774-1780. At first the opposition usually numbered only forty or fifty. By the beginning of 1776 it had increased to eighty or ninety. While the surrender of Burgoyne had no effect upon it, the news of the French alliance immediately added forty or fifty members. Speaking generally, it was not till this time that the country gentlemen began to go over. From this point the opposition steadily increased till Dunning's motion was carried. Dr. Abbott described the nature of the ministerial party and its resulting liability to sudden collapse, the influence of army officers discredited by the government be-

cause of defeat, the small effects of the accession of Fox. He concluded that the American War had less influence on Parliament than was commonly supposed ; and that enlistments were not so difficult, nor the war so generally unpopular, as has been thought.

Professor Dunning of Columbia University then spoke on the Undoing of Reconstruction. Contrasting the abundant possession of political power by the negroes in 1870, when reconstruction was complete, with their present exclusion from the exercise of political rights, he characterized the three chief periods of the process through which this has come about. The first period, which had already begun during the years of reconstruction, and was complete by 1877, was marked by the ejection of the blacks from the governments of the Southern states especially through the "Mississippi plan" of systematic intimidation. The second, 1877-1890, during which the balance of national political parties made partisan Federal legislation impossible, while the judiciary rejected the Civil Rights Acts, was the period of fraud as distinguished from force. The last decade had been marked by open assertion of the necessity of repression and of white rule, and by systematic endeavors, through constitutional revision, to legalize what had before been done illegally. Professor Dunning dwelt on the thoughts, that the problem of the co-existence of the two races in the United States could not be settled by the mere abolition of slavery ; and that the undoing of reconstruction had shown that it could not be settled on the basis of equality.

In the discussion which ensued, Professor Hart of Harvard, alluding to the various aspects under which the subject might be discussed, confined himself to the question how far success had been attained in the great endeavor to abolish the distinction of color in legal relations. He touched upon the abolition of slavery, the extent to which there was equality before the courts, the exclusion from the franchise, and the failure to secure social equality. Mr. Percy N. Booth of Louisville spoke of the drift of the Southern negroes into the black states, from the highlands into the lowlands, and away from the villages,—the apparent tendency toward isolation of the races. Dr. Theodore Clarke Smith discussed the question, what the Republican leaders of the reconstruction movement expected. He showed that most were uncertain ; that Stevens's aim was to secure party supremacy and the results of the war ; that Sumner, Wilson and Greeley, filled with the spirit of the liberalism of their generation, had no doubts. The negro was a man, therefore give him a vote. He was a man, therefore he would use it well. Stevens and many others thought that there would be

enough Southern white Republicans to control him. Others, with some doubting, thought that he would soon learn. Others expected that his vote would always be so valuable to either side that he would be courted by both. Others thought that he would maintain his newly conferred rights only so long as supported by force. All predictions proved wrong except these last. The reasons why the Republicans had acquiesced in the recent situation were, first, that they had concluded that the dangers apprehended by Stevens were imaginary; secondly, because of the decay of the old-fashioned liberalism, of the belief in equal rights and abstract rights generally, and the substitution of an evolutionary philanthropy for that based on the earlier doctrines.

With this ended the sessions devoted to papers. If any general criticism were to be ventured, it would be that too many of the writers ignored that wholesome rule of the Association, printed conspicuously upon the programme, which limited papers to twenty minutes, and discussions to ten minutes for each speaker. Deliberately to prepare and read a paper forty minutes long is an act without excuse; nor can much be said in defense of "brief remarks" extending to fifteen or twenty minutes. The kindly gentlemen who presided, not being presidents, were evidently reluctant, clothed in a little brief authority, to apply the *clôture*; but many hearers would fain have seen them truculent and remorseless. Another evil, deserving correction in future meetings, is the substitution, for fresh and real discussion of the longer papers, of cut-and-dried short papers. The "liberty of prophesying" which prevailed in the earlier meetings of the Association had its evils; but a Rhadamanthine president can avert them.

At noon the two associations partook together of a subscription luncheon at the Russell House. President Angell, to everyone's enjoyment, acted as toastmaster, and talked entertainingly of the growth of the historical and economic professions since the time when he was at college. Mr. Henry Russel, attorney of the Michigan Central Railroad, read in honor of Hon. Peter White a humorous dialect poem entitled "Pierre Le Blanc." Professor Ely, Mr. Reuben G. Thwaites of Madison, Professor W. Z. Ripley of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Professor Hart also spoke.

The business session, on Saturday afternoon, was unusually well attended, and there was evidence of warm interest in the many important tasks which the Association has entrusted, or proposed to entrust, to its committees. It was reported that there were 1,626 members of the Association, representing a gain of 215 over last

year. The next meeting had, by previous arrangement, been appointed to be held at Washington. The Council reported in favor of meeting in April 1902; but the Association preferred to meet as usual at Christmas-time. It was left to the Committee on the Programme to fix the date more exactly, in conference with the American Economic Association. It can now be announced, with a fair degree of assurance, that the sessions will be held on Saturday, December 28, Monday, December 30 and Tuesday, December 31. The constitution was so amended as to provide for the existence of both a secretary and a corresponding secretary. The Council announced the appointment of Professor Charles H. Haskins of the University of Wisconsin as chairman of the Committee on Programme, and of General A. W. Greeley, U. S. A., of Washington, as chairman of the Local Committee of Arrangements, for the seventeenth annual meeting; and each was given authority to complete his committee at his discretion. It also announced the reelection of Professor George B. Adams of Yale University as a member of the Board of Editors of the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, for the term expiring January 1, 1907.

The death of the First Vice-President and the resignation of the Secretary gave especial significance to the election of officers at this meeting. The Second Vice-President, Mr. Charles Francis Adams of Massachusetts, was elected President of the Association; Professor Herbert B. Adams of Baltimore, the retiring secretary, First Vice-President; Captain Alfred T. Mahan, U. S. N., Second Vice-President. Mr. A. Howard Clark, hitherto assistant secretary, was elected Secretary; Professor Haskins Corresponding Secretary. Chief Justice Fuller and Professor Hart retiring from the Council, Professors A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard and J. Franklin Jameson of Brown University were elected in their places. A full list of the officers of the Association and of the members of its committees, so far as determined at the time of going to press, is given on a later page, at the end of the present article. A minute expressing the Society's appreciation of the long and effective services of Professor Herbert B. Adams as Secretary was adopted by a rising vote. Professor Theodor Mommsen of Berlin was elected an honorary member. It was agreed that delegates should be elected to the International Historical Congress to be held at Rome in 1902. Resolutions expressing the sorrow of the members at the loss of Professor Moses Coit Tyler were adopted by a standing vote. The project of a "Monographic History of America," to be issued under the auspices of the Society, was discussed at some length. It was finally referred back to the Council for further con-

sideration and for discussion at the next annual meeting. For reference in view of this discussion, we subjoin to this article a statement prepared by Professor Hart and sent out by the Council shortly before the Detroit meeting.

The Treasurer, Dr. Clarence W. Bowen, made one of those highly gratifying reports for which he is now looked to annually with perfect confidence. Though the expenditures of the year had been substantially \$5335, he showed assets of \$13,405, an increase of \$824 since last year. Mr. Thwaites reported for the Historical Manuscripts Commission. Professor Charles M. Andrews of Bryn Mawr, chairman of the committee on the Justin Winsor Prize, reported that it was awarded to Mr. W. A. Shaper of Dubuque, hereafter to be a member of the faculty of the University of Minnesota, for an essay on "Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina." He also reported a code of rules for the award of the prize in future years. They were adopted by the meeting, and are printed on a later page, at the end of the present article. Reports were also made by Professor George B. Adams, for the editorial board of the *REVIEW*, by Professor Edward G. Bourne, chairman of the Committee on Publications, and by Professor William MacDonald of Bowdoin College, chairman of the Public Archives Commission. Resolutions were adopted expressing thanks for the hospitality of those who have been mentioned above as entertaining the Association, and to the two committees who had assured the success of the meeting; and the Association adjourned.

PROJECT OF A CO-OPERATIVE HISTORY.

The Committee appointed at Boston to consider a co-operative history of the United States has reported to the Council in favor of the project, and will ask the Council at the Detroit meeting to pass the following proposed vote:

Voted, That a standing committee of five be appointed to arrange for the publication of a co-operative history of the United States, under the auspices of the Association, on the following conditions:

1. The Committee to have power to decide on the scope and extent of the work; the publication to be made in small volumes, each complete in itself so far as it goes.
2. The Committee to have power to choose an editor-in-chief, to carry on the work, subject to the determinations of the Committee, which will represent the Association.
3. The Committee to have power to make publishing arrangements.
4. The Association in no case to have any pecuniary responsibility or liability for any expense connected with the history.

5. The Committee to report annually to the Association until the work is finished.

Experienced publishers believe that a work prepared on this plan, under the supervision of the Association, would easily pay for itself. Inasmuch as the plan is a new one, the chairman of the special committee (Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, Cambridge, Massachusetts) will be glad to have the opinions of members of the Association by letter before the Detroit meeting.

THE JUSTIN WINSOR PRIZE.

The Justin Winsor prize of \$100, offered by the American Historical Association for the encouragement of historical research, will be awarded for the year 1901 to the best unpublished monograph in the field of American History which shall be submitted to the Committee of Award on or before October 1, 1901.

I. The prize is intended for writers who have not yet published any considerable work or obtained an established reputation.

II. The monograph must be based upon independent and original investigation in American history, by which is meant the history of any of the British colonies in America to 1776, of other portions of the continent which have since been included in the territory of the United States, and of the United States. It may deal with any aspect of that history—social, political, constitutional, religious, economic, military, or biographical, though in the last two instances a treatment exclusively military or biographical would be unfavorably received.

III. The subject matter of the monograph must be of more than personal or local interest and in its conclusions and results must be a distinct contribution to knowledge. In its statements it must attain a high degree of accuracy and in its treatment of the facts collected it must show on the part of the writer powers of original and suggestive interpretation.

IV. The work must conform to the accepted canons of historical research and criticism. It must be presented in what is commonly understood as a scientific manner, and must contain the necessary apparatus of critical bibliography (a mere list of titles will not be deemed sufficient), references to all authorities, and footnotes. In length the work should not be less than 30,000 words or about 100 pages of print. It may be more. If not typewritten, the work must be written legibly upon only one side of the sheet, and must be in form ready for publication. In making the award, the Committee will take into consideration, not only research, accuracy, and originality, but also clearness of expression, logical arrangement, and literary form. The prize will not be awarded unless the work submitted shall be of a high degree of excellence. The successful monograph will be published by the American Historical Association. Address all correspondence to the Chairman of the Committee, Professor Charles M. Andrews, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION.

<i>President,</i>	Charles Francis Adams, Esq.
<i>First Vice-President,</i>	Professor Herbert B. Adams.
<i>Second Vice-President,</i>	Captain Alfred T. Mahan, U. S. N.
<i>Secretary,</i>	A. Howard Clark, Esq.
<i>Corresponding Secretary,</i>	Professor Charles H. Haskins.
<i>Treasurer,</i>	Clarence W. Bowen, Esq.
<i>Secretary of the Church History Section,</i>	Rev. Dr. Samuel M. Jackson.
<i>Executive Council</i> (in addition to	the above named officers):
	Hon. Andrew D. White, ¹
	President Charles Kendall Adams, ¹
	President James B. Angell, ¹
	Henry Adams, Esq., ¹
	Hon. George F. Hoar, ¹
	James Schouler, Esq., ¹
	Professor George P. Fisher, ¹
	James Ford Rhodes, Esq., ¹
	Edward Eggleston, Esq., ¹
	Professor George B. Adams, ²
	Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, ²
	Professor William A. Dunning, ²
	Hon. Peter White, ²
	Professor J. Franklin Jameson, ²
	Professor A. Lawrence Lowell. ²

Committees:

Committee on the Programme of the Next Meeting: Professor Charles H. Haskins, chairman, Professor George B. Adams, Dr. Samuel M. Jackson, Professor William MacDonald, President Lyon G. Tyler, and Professor J. M. Vincent.

Local Committee of Arrangements: General A. W. Greeley (with authority to complete the committee).

Historical Manuscripts Commission: Professor Edward G. Bourne, chairman, Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq., Professor F. W. Moore, Professor Max Farrand, Dr. T. C. Smith.

Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize: Professor C. M. Andrews, chairman, Professor E. P. Cheyney, Miss Elizabeth Kendall, Roger Foster, Esq., Professor E. E. Sparks.

¹ Ex-presidents.

² Elected members.

Committee on Bibliography: A. Howard Clark, Esq., chairman, Messrs. W. E. Foster, J. N. Larned, George Iles, W. C. Lane, A. P. C. Griffin and E. C. Richardson.

Committee on Publications: [Professor E. G. Bourne, chairman,] A. Howard Clark, Esq., Professor F. M. Fling, Rev. Dr. S. M. Jackson, Professor A. D. Morse, Miss Sarah M. Dean, E. F. Henderson, Esq., and Professor Charles Gross.

Public Archives Commission: Professor William MacDonald, chairman, Professors L. G. Bugbee and H. W. Caldwell.

General Committee: The Corresponding Secretary, chairman, Miss Lucy M. Salmon, Professors G. E. Howard, William MacDonald and J. H. Robinson.

THE YEAR 1000 AND THE ANTECEDENTS OF THE CRUSADES¹

THE passion of the nineteenth century has been the study of origins. Our historians of the Crusades, seeking a starting-point, have been prone to find one (though not the only one) in a panic of terror said to have fallen upon Christendom as it neared the close of the first thousand years of its existence—a belief that the world would end with the year 1000.

Thus Michaud, at the opening of the century; thus Archer, at its closing. Even Heinrich von Sybel, whose epoch-making history of the First Crusade opened a new era of critical study in this field, and who, in the revised edition published in 1881, could with just pride congratulate himself that in the forty years since its first appearance its main conclusions had been adopted by all leading scholars, and could hope that “perhaps in another forty years they will have the fortune to find a place in the manuals and the text-books,” tells us still in this new edition that

“As the first thousand years of our calendar drew to an end, in every land of Europe the people expected with certainty the destruction of the world. Some squandered their substance in riotous living, others bestowed it for the salvation of their souls on churches and convents, bewailing multitudes lay by day and by night about the altars, many looked with terror, yet most with a secret hope, for the conflagration of the earth and the falling of the heavens.”²

Alas for human fallibility! The legend which he thus re-echoes had within the decade been already twice refuted, and with a conclusiveness more crushing than his own exposure of the legends of the First Crusade. In the score of years that since has passed Peter the Hermit and Godfrey of Bouillon have even in manual and text-book begun to take the background. Is it not time, now that three further critics have sifted, and with the same result, the legend of the year 1000, that it should vanish from our thought of the Crusades? And could we find a better moment for its study

¹ Read, at the late annual meeting of the American Historical Association, as the opening paper of a session devoted to the Crusades and the East.

² H. v. Sybel, *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs* (2te, neu bearbeitete Auflage, Leipzig, 1881), p. 150.

than now, as we stand at the threshold of another Christian century and look across it to the near close of another millennium?

The earliest author, and the only pre-modern one, in whose pages has been found any mention of a panic at the year 1000 is the German abbot Joannes Tritemius, who lived and wrote just as the fifteenth century was changing to the sixteenth. In his chronicle of the world, the *Annales Hirsaugienses*, as it now lies before us, there is, in the passage devoted to the year 1000, this sentence: "In this year a terrible comet appeared, which by its look terrified many, who feared that the last day was at hand; inasmuch as several years before it had been predicted by some, deluded by a false calculation, that the visible world would end in the year of Christ 1000." But, as this chronicle, left in manuscript by its author, was never printed in full till 1690, as the abridged form earlier printed says nothing of this panic, even mentioning the comet in another connection, and as by 1690 the belief in such a panic was already in vogue from other sources, there is much reason to suspect that the sentence belongs not to Tritemius but to his seventeenth-century editors. Whether his or not, it should perhaps be brought into connection with an earlier passage, under the year 960, which tells of the appearance at the council of princes in Worms of a Thuringian hermit, named Bernhard, well versed in the scriptures and popularly venerated as a saint, who declared it revealed to him that the end of the world was already at hand. Some, says Tritemius, thought him an inspired prophet, while others laughed at him as a man out of his mind or swollen by self-conceit.

But the first book to publish to the world the millennial terror was the famous *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Cardinal Baronius, in 1605. Beginning with the year 1001 the eleventh volume of his great work, he opens it with the statement that this year, the first of a new century, had been by some "foretold as the world's last, or nigh thereto, when Antichrist should be revealed;" and he quotes in full from the tenth-century abbot, Abbo of Fleury, a passage telling how while he was yet a youth he heard in Paris a preacher declare that at the end of the thousandth year Antichrist should come and not long after him the Judgment,¹ and how once in Lorraine there had spread a report that when Annunciation Day should fall on Good Friday the end of the world would arrive. To this, from Sigebert of Gembloux he adds a list of the prodigies seen in the year 1000, remarking that these might well seem heralds of

¹ "De fine quoque mundi coram populo sermonem in Ecclesia Parisiorum adolescentulus audiui, quod statim, finito mille annorum numero, Antichristus adveniret, et non longo post tempore, universale judicium succederet."

such a catastrophe, then quotes from Gerbert a rhetorical allusion to the impending days of Antichrist and from Thietmar and Radulf Glaber such testimony to the corruption of the times as could well make it believable.

For what is found in a work of such authority one does not too closely scan the proofs. Thus set afloat, the story was sure to spread; and like all good stories, it grew. In 1633 Le Vasseur, in his annals of the church of Noyon, enriched it with the statement, which he thought he drew from Radulf Glaber—the familiar passage about the earth's "covering herself with a white robe of churches"—that the world's escape from the terrors of the year 1000 was the occasion of a great burst of church-building. Thus enriched, it passed into the great Benedictine works of the eighteenth century—the annals of Mabillon, the dictionary of Calmet, the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*—and into many another standard work of learning. If here and there a scholar like Fleury, Muratori, Voltaire, Gibbon, gave it no mention, the silence passed unnoticed.

But it was the Scotchman Robertson who made it a commonplace of history. In that luminous *View of the Progress of Society in Europe during the Middle Ages* which in 1769 he prefaced to his *History of Charles the Fifth*, and which, translated into all European tongues, remained for a century the favorite survey of medieval civilization, he not only emphasized the panic, bringing it into direct connection with the Crusades, but gave it a more scientific standing by citing in its support, besides Abbo, three medieval chronicles—those of St. Pantaleon and Godellus and the "Annalista Saxo." It remained only, in our own century, for that inspired Frenchman, Jules Michelet, to reveal its worth to literature at large. It is the keynote of that majestic prose dirge upon the misery of France under the early Capetians with which, in 1833, he began this period of his great history. And he lends it vividness by working into his narrative, after his fashion, not only from the chronicles, but from the Councils and from the preambles of charters,¹ what seem corroborative extracts.

Poet, novelist, dramatist, have since made the most of it.² Even the German historian-poet, Felix Dahn, was beguiled into devoting to it a cycle of lyrics; and the Italian poet-historian Carducci has depicted it in a prose poem more melodious than verse.

Yet protesting voices began to be raised. In 1840 the Italian jurist Francesco Forti doubted that the panic could have been gen-

¹ These, indeed, Michaud, the historian of the Crusades, had used before him.

² A long list, though by no means an exhaustive one, is given by Orsi, in his monograph later to be mentioned.

eral. In 1861 the French archaeologist Auber denied and disproved its effect upon architecture. In 1867 Olleris, the editor of the works of Gerbert, felt forced to exclaim: "One does not see that this fatal date then inspired in anybody the terror which was later singularly exaggerated by ignorant monks."

But it was not till 1873 that a scholar took the legend seriously in hand. Then, at last, in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* the Benedictine François Plaine put it to a sifting so thorough that his might well have been the last word.¹ Dealing first with the monkish historians of the later Middle Ages, he showed that the story was no exaggeration of theirs, since not one of them mentions it at all. Then, taking up one by one the contemporary annalists of the early eleventh century, Italian, German, French, English, he pointed out their utter silence as to such a panic, nay more, how much in them seems incompatible with such a thing. Next he discussed the true meaning of that handful of passages which to Baronius, to Robertson, to Michelet, had seemed to imply such a terror. True it is that the Council of Trosly reminded the bishops that "soon we shall behold the majestic and terrible day when every shepherd with his flock shall appear before the supreme Shepherd." But the Council of Trosly was in the year 909, its words specify no date for the end of things, and they were only such words as had been constantly heard since the birth of Christianity. The abbot Adson, it is true, wrote, about the year 954, a booklet on the Antichrist. But it was only a book of exegesis, meant to enlighten Queen Gerberga on an obscure point of the faith, and it nowhere intimates that the author himself or anybody else thought Antichrist at hand. It is true that Abbo of Fleury tells of a preacher at Paris who looked for the end of the world in the year 1000; but he tells us also that he himself refuted him from Scripture on the spot, and, though it is clear from the allusion to his youth that this could hardly have been later than the year 960, while Abbo wrote his narrative in 998, he nowhere intimates that the delusion was ever heard of again. True, he represents the people of Lorraine as later (it must have been about 975) terrified at the prospect of Annunciation's falling on Good Friday; but this conjunction was due in the year 992, and he not only tells us that the delusion was refuted (which was the easier because the two days had already fallen together more than once) but that it was dispelled.² Nor can it be denied that the monk William Godel, writing a

¹ *Revue des Questions Historiques*, XXIII. 145-164. Paris, 1873.

² His *Apologeticus*, in which these passages occur, is addressed to the King of France, and in it he is demonstrating his own orthodoxy by recounting the errors which during his lifetime he has known and fought.

couple of centuries later, does, as Robertson says, assert that in the year 1010 people in many places thought in their fright that the end of the world was at hand ; but the *whole* of what he says is that “ *at the news of the taking of Jerusalem by the Turks* people in their fright thought the end of the world at hand ”—a phrase which will hardly be taken too seriously. And, after all, the year 1010 was not the year 1000.¹

And Radulf Glaber—*Anglice* Ralph the Bald—on whom, above all, the tradition has been made to rest ? If anybody could know of a panic at the year 1000, it would surely be Radulf Glaber—a superstitious and garrulous old monk, who, in a day when monasteries were the only inns, and when his Burgundian home, on the border of three realms, was the highway for that army of pilgrims pressing ever to Cluny and to Rome, spent his life at this, that, and the other abbey, with ears wide open for every tale of prodigy, and widest for those of direful import. He believed, too, in the mystic worth of numbers, and the year 1000 was precisely the theme of his chronicle : he would relate, he said, the uncommon multitude of edifying things which had come to pass in the vicinage of the thousandth year of Christ's incarnation. Yet, alas, though his pages are alive with signs and wonders in Heaven and in Earth, and though not a few of these belong to the year 1000 itself, not even Radulf knows of any fear that then the world would end. The only passage savoring of such a thought, is his portrayal of that terrible famine which fell “ as there drew on the thousand and thirty-third year of the incarnate Christ, which is from the *passion* of the said Saviour the thousandth.”

There remain the preambles of the charters ; but it was easy for Dom Plaine to point out that such preambles were but copied bodily out of a formula-book, and that the particular one cited in evidence—*appropinquante mundi termino*—belongs to the old collection of Marculf and has been demonstrably in use since the seventh century ; easy, too, to demonstrate that the formula continued in use after the year 1000, as before.

Turning then from the ruined legend, the Benedictine showed what a busy and aggressive time for Christendom was that year of alleged despair—when the wisest man of his day, Gerbert, was Pope, and the most enthusiastic, young Otto, was Emperor—when Hungary and Bohemia and the Scandinavian North were simultaneously turning to the Christian faith, and the Spaniards with renewed vigor were forcing back their Moslem neighbors. And nowhere in

¹ As for the chronicle of St. Pantaleon and the Saxon annalist, cited by Robertson, the terror mentioned by them occurred a century later, at the time of the First Crusade.

all this, or in what we are told in the lesser activities of church and society, the slightest mention of such a motive as the impending end of the world.

In fine, then, the sole contemporary evidence for a panic of terror at the year 1000 proved to be a statement that forty years earlier one Paris preacher named it as the date of the end of the world—a preacher whose prophecy was at once refuted, and, for aught we can learn, at once forgotten,

The refutation was crushing. Yet one convinced against his will might in this essay by an ecclesiastic for a conservative review suspect a partisan loyalty to the Middle Ages. And it must be confessed that its tone is a trifle polemic. But no suspicion of conservatism could lie against the next assailant. It was the anti-clerical Raoul Rosières, who five years later, in 1878, when about to bring out the two works¹ by which he hoped to help “declericalize” and “deroyalize” France, found it necessary to test this legend before using it. His study he published in the *Revue Politique*.² His analysis of the question, though slightly briefer, was not less effective. His results were the same. As he clearly knew nothing of the earlier paper of Dom Plaine and stood for so opposite a point of approach, the agreement of their conclusions was the more convincing.

French scholarship needed no further enlightenment; but the Germans, witness Von Sybel, were not yet all abreast. It was in 1883 that Heinrich von Eicken, doubtless already gathering material for what is still our best book on the medieval point of view,³ brought the matter of the year 1000, by an article in a German historical review, to the notice of German scholars.⁴ Though he had seen Rosières's paper, he knows nothing of that of Dom Plaine; and even, he tells us, before knowing of Rosières's, his own studies had lately convinced him of the baselessness of the tradition. It is especially from German sources that he now confirms and expands the work of the Frenchman.

The latest word in defence of the legend which I remember to have heard from any competent scholar was from Léon Gautier, lecturing to his class in the École des Chartes at Paris, in the win-

¹ His *Recherches sur l'Histoire Religieuse de la France* (Paris, 1879), and his *Histoire de la Société Française au Moyen-Age*, 987-1483 (Paris, 1880).

² *Revue Politique et Littéraire*, 2d series, XIV. 919-924 (Paris, 1878). His article is entitled: *Études Nouvelles sur l'Ancienne France: La Légende de l'An Mil*.

³ His *Geschichte und System der mittelalterlichen Weltanschauung*.

⁴ *Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte*, XXIII. 303-318 (Göttingen, 1883). His article calls itself: *Die Legende von der Erwartung des Weltunterganges und der Wiederkehr Christi im Jahre 1000*.

ter of 1885. He admitted the refutation of the narrative evidence, but still thought that in the charters the formula about the end of the world grew more frequent as the year 1000 approached. But even while he spoke his younger colleague, M. Jules Roy, was preparing, for the popular *Bibliothèque des Merveilles*, a little monograph which should not only dispel such lingering doubts, but reach the ear of a wider public.¹ This interesting little volume, after dealing with the whole history of the fear of the end of the world and refuting the legend of the year 1000, portrays from the sources the real condition of the world and especially of France in the last half of the tenth century and the first of the eleventh.

At almost the same time a young Italian scholar who has since won eminence as an historian—Pietro Orsi—was making the year 1000 and its legend the subject of a thesis at the University of Turin. First presented in 1884, it was able, before its publication in 1887 in the *Rivista Storica Italiana*, to take cognizance of Roy's book, and is for scholars the most methodical and exhaustive exposition of its theme.² But, though more complete, its results tally with those of Plaine and Rosières and Eicken and Roy; and at the end its author can but echo their conclusion: "The terrors of the year 1000 are only a legend and a myth." Nor has any scholar, since the first assault, a quarter-century ago, cared to print a word in protest.

But, I hear you exclaim, you who have felt how awesome, even in these rational days, is the ending of a century, how could there help being terror, in that age, at the close of a millennium? It was, I am convinced, precisely this sense of intrinsic probability which made it so easy for scholars else cautious and thorough to fall into the error; and it may be worth a moment to ask why such a panic was not then so natural as at first appears.

First of all, and most important, the belief in the end of the world was already worn out. It had cried "Wolf" too often. It began with the very first generation of Christians, and sought a warrant in the words of the Christ himself. Almost the oldest Christian book we have—the second letter of Paul to the Thessalonians—is a protest against it. But it lived on. It found an echo in the Apocalypse and in the letters ascribed to Peter and to Jude. It sounded on through the Fathers, from Tertullian to Gregory the

¹ *L'An Mille: Formation de la Légende de l'An Mille, —État de la France de l'an 950 à l'an 1050* (Paris, 1885), 351 pp. There is at the end an excellent bibliography.

² *L'Anno Mille: Saggio di Critica Storica* (Torino, 1887), 62 pp., reprinted from the *Rivista Storica Italiana*, Vol. IV. (1887). In 1891 Professor Orsi threw it into briefer popular form for a lecture, at Venice, on *Le Paure del Finimondo nell' Anno 1000*. This was also published (Turin, 1891, 31 pp.).

Great. Augustine, like Paul, had to make a stand against it. The end was always coming, and never came. But precisely for this reason it grew at length a mark of orthodoxy to deny that the time of the end could be foreknown, and on the lips of all pious churchmen, as on those of Adson and Abbo in the tenth century, were the words "Of that day and hour knoweth no man," "The day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night." Even the credulous millenarian, whose own millennium was of course no thousand years of this world, but the thousand of Christ's reign which should follow it, yet who had built on the prophecies of Old Testament and New, and especially on the text that "with God a thousand years are as one day," a belief that his millennial Sabbath would set in at the end of the sixth thousand years from the Creation (and even Augustine believed that this was in his day nearly up), must have felt his faith wax faint as date after date inferred from Ezekiel and from Daniel passed by and brought no change. Bishop Gregory of Tours in the sixth century wrote his chronicle of the times already past *propter eos qui adpropinquantem mundi finem desperant*—"for the sake of those who despair of the end of the world." In the tenth century, then, it was only ignorant laymen like those of Lorraine, or some ill-trained visionary like Abbo's preacher, who could put faith in a date for the end of the world. And Dom Plaine may well be right in believing that it was only the revival of millenary dreams in the century following the Reformation which made it easy for Baronius and his contemporaries to fancy a panic at the year 1000.

It must be remembered, further, that the round numbers of a decimal system had much less vogue in the tenth century than now. It was the I, V, X, L, C, D, M, of the old Roman notation which governed the numerical ideas of men. Nor was currency, or weight, or measure, in the scales of that day a decimal matter. Under the influence of the Hebrew Scriptures even the decimals of classical antiquity had largely given place to the sacred round numbers of the Jews—the threes, the sevens, the twelves, and their multiples; and especially was this the case in all that pertained to prophecy.

Nor may one forget that the Christian calendar itself was yet a novel thing in the year 1000. The monk Dionysius, who at the middle of the sixth century devised it, had no authority to impose its adoption; and it crept but slowly into use. Monkish chronicles had early begun to employ it; but the first pope to date by the Christian era his official letters was John XIII., scarce thirty years before the year 1000; and "its use," says the latest and highest authority, Arthur Giry, "did not become general in the west of

Europe till after the year 1000"—wherefore the name of *millésime*, by which the French still call a Christian date. In Spain, indeed, it was not used until the fourteenth century; and by Greek Christians not until the fifteenth.

Even when it had come in, it was reinforced in all formal papers by other datings—by the regnal years of pope or emperor or king, by the year of the indiction, perhaps by others. Nor was it yet or for long agreed just how to reckon by the Christian calendar. Some preferred to count their years from the Lord's Passion, instead of his Incarnation. And if from the Incarnation, should that be dated from the Nativity, at December 25, or from the Conception, three-quarters of a year earlier? Dionysius himself would seem to have preferred the latter; and even to this day we cannot be sure whether he meant to place the birth of Christ at the beginning or at the end of the first year of our Christian calendar—in the year 753 or the year 754 of the Roman city. Throughout the Middle Ages there prevailed the widest variance as to when the New Year should set in—here it was begun at Christmas, there at Annunciation, yonder at Easter, in Venice on the first of March, in Russia at the vernal equinox, in the Greek Empire on the first of September, in Spain on the first of January. Florence and Pisa, agreeing in the use of that Mary-year which was still in vogue among our great-grandfathers in England and America as late as 1752, could yet not agree *which* twenty-fifth of March one ought to count from; and, neighbor-towns though they were, Pisa began her year just twelve months ahead of Florence. What havoc must this work with the punctuality of the end of the world!

And if through such confusion men's sense of date grew blunt, how much more through the needlessness to most people of dates at all—that is, of Christian-era dates. To us who at every turn are stared at by calendars and date-lines, who must every day of our lives again and again write day and month and year, it is not easy to realize a world wherein all this is the affair of priests and notaries. The ordinary man, gentle and simple, of the year 1000, could not have read a date if he had seen it. And, just as the hours of the day were to him not figures on a dial but those reminders which at prime and terce and sext and none and evensong called to him through the sweet bells of parish-church or minster, so his landmarks of the year were the great days of the Church, her feasts, her vigils, and her fasts—Easter and Ascension and Whitsunday, Michaelmas and Christmas and Ash-Wednesday—underscored and red-lettered for him by the solemn pageantry of worship. If Annunciation and Good Friday fell together, that was startling; but what recked he of years of the Incarnation?

Is it so strange, then, that the panic of the year 1000 is only a nightmare of modern scholars?

But there is another myth of the year 1000 whose relation to the Crusades is more patent. Among the letters of Gerbert, who in that year sat upon the papal throne as Silvester II., there has come down to us a curious document. It bears no date of year or place, and only its presence there suggests its authorship. "She who is Jerusalem"—for so the document begins—appeals to the universal church for aid. At first glance its fervid phrases seem a call to arms against her pagan spoilers, and in it scholars long saw the earliest suggestion of the Crusades. It was imputed to the pope among whose papers it was found, and some believed that it was the terrors of the year 1000 which had called it forth. It has, however, nothing in common with a papal utterance, and those who were content to count it Gerbert's were by no means agreed to count it his as Pope. In 1877 that arch-skeptic Julius Harttung (later Pflugk-Harttung) denied it to him altogether, advancing much cogent argument to prove it an effusion of a century later which had somehow strayed into Gerbert's papers.¹ In 1881 his view received the weighty adhesion of Count Paul Riant, who strengthened it by further argument.² Their verdict met acceptance at the hands of other scholars, including the authoritative editors of the *Papal Regesta*,³ though Heinrich von Sybel refused to be convinced. But in 1889 that prince of historical mousers, the lamented Julien Havet, propounded a more satisfying theory.⁴ It is not, he points out, a call to arms, but only a call for money—"a sort of circular, meant to be carried about by a collector of alms for the Christian establishments at Jerusalem." It may well have been written, Havet thinks, by Gerbert, but probably in the spring of 984, long before his papacy, and perhaps for the use of his friend the abbot Guarin, known to have been interested in this collection of alms for the Holy Land.

So passes one of the most famous of the antecedents of the Crusades. And with it, at the hands of the critics—they are again Harttung and Riant—has fallen the bull ostensibly called forth by the Moslem destruction of the Holy Sepulchre in 1010. Pope Sergius, addressing the princes and prelates of Catholic Christen-

¹ *Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte*, XVII. 390-396 (Göttingen, 1877). The article is called *Zur Vorgeschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges*.

² In his *Inventaire des Lettres Historiques des Croisades*, in the *Archives de l'Orient Latin*, I. (Paris, 1881.)

³ Wattenbach and his colleagues, in the edition of 1885. In Jaffé's original edition it does not appear.

⁴ In his edition of the *Lettres de Gerbert*, 983-987 (Paris, 1889), p. 22, note.

dom, summons them to a common expedition for the delivery of the holy places. This document, which exists in but a single manuscript, and that a transcript, though of the eleventh century, they deem a clumsy forgery, produced in the days of the First Crusade. As to its motive they are not at one. With it must pass from credence the expedition said by it to be preparing by Venice and Genoa,—as there had already fallen the legend (based on more misunderstanding) of Pisan exploits of this period in the Levant.

As the earliest summons to the Holy War against Islam, then, there remain the famous letters of Pope Gregory VII., in 1074. Of these (excepting that to the Countess Matilda) the genuineness is not questioned; but later historians, following Von Sybel, see in them less than did the earlier. What they mainly urge is the rescue not of the Holy Land, but of Asia Minor; their motive, politic not less than pious, is the salvation of the Greek church and the restoration of Armenian orthodoxy; their means, not an armed pilgrimage of Latin Christendom, but an invading army. And such as it was, the enterprise was with Gregory but a passing impulse.

For the conception, then, as well as for the initiation, of the Crusades proper we are brought to their very eve. To discuss the sources and the legends of the First Crusade is the task of another. Yet from this hasty survey of the havoc wrought by modern criticism among their antecedents, it must not be gathered that to present-day scholars the Crusades had no remoter causes. They are to be sought still in the ascetic spirit and the theocratic ideals of the age, in the love of travel and of venture, begotten in it by pilgrimage, in the over-population of the West, in the rise of chivalry and in the intolerable havoc wrought by its private wars, in the Church's assumption by the Truce of God to check and even to direct its energies, above all in those brilliant enterprises of the eleventh century, suggested or sanctioned by the Church, which appealed alike to the piety, the valor, and the ambition of every knightly soul—the deeds of the Normans in England, in Italy, in the Greek Empire, the beating back of the Moors in Spain, the African raids of the Italian sea-powers. Let, then, the century's last word on the deeper causes of the Crusades be that of Bishop Stubbs: "They were the first great effort of medieval life to go beyond the pursuit of selfish and isolated ambitions; they were the trial-feat of the young world, essaying to use, to the glory of God and the benefit of man, the arms of its new knighthood."

GEORGE LINCOLN BURR.

THE POLITICAL INFLUENCE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS IN THE MIDDLE AGES

THE University of Paris was distinguished from all other universities of the Middle Ages by its prominence in political affairs. While the great schools of Italy, Germany, and England held aloof from secular politics, the *civitas philosophorum* on Mt. Ste. Geneviève often asserted itself as a potent factor in the political life of France. The learned doctors of Paris seem indeed often to have been more interested in the strife of party factions than in the disputations of their scholars, and at times the University acted as if it were an important organ of the state rather than a school of learning.¹

We hear little of its participation in political affairs before the years 1356-1358, when it took part in the stirring events associated with the name of Étienne Marcel. Its political *rôle* in the conflict between Marcel and the Dauphin of France has often been exaggerated. The University was twice called upon to mediate between the two parties, but did not openly espouse the cause of either faction, though it was inclined to favor the cause of the Dauphin.²

It does not seem to have intervened in secular politics during the reign of Charles V. (1364-1380), but came into political prominence under his successor, Charles VI., especially during the struggle between the Burgundians and Armagnacs. In fact, the years 1405-1422 comprise the period when the University was most active in the affairs of the state. During this period it was usually in sympathy with the Burgundians, but strove to mediate between the two parties and to establish peace.

Its attitude as a peace-maker is illustrated by many documents in the *Chartularium*. In 1405 the rector and divers "solemn" doctors admonished the Duke of Orléans to look to the reforma-

¹ The older historians of the University, Du Boulay, Crevier, and Dubarle, devote little attention to its political activity, but some of the documents in Du Boulay's book are useful. Nor does this subject fall within the scope of the first volume of Denifle's epoch-making work (*Die Universitäten des Mittelalters*, 1885). It is briefly examined in Rashdall's *Universities of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1895), Vol. I., Ch. V., § 6. The fourth volume of Denifle's *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* (Paris, 1897), which covers the years 1394-1452, now enables the investigator adequately to deal with the subject.

² Jourdain, in *Revue des Questions Historiques*, 1878, XXIV. 548-566; and in his *Excursions Historiques* (Paris, 1888), 339-361.

tion of the realm and to effect a reconciliation with the Duke of Burgundy. Louis of Orléans angrily retorted: "As you do not consult knights in questions of religion, so you ought not to meddle in questions of war; therefore return to your books and attend to your own affairs, for, though the University is called the daughter of the king, she should not interfere with the government of the kingdom."¹ In 1408 Gerson, on behalf of the University, strove to reconcile the two dukes;² and in 1410 certain masters were sent to exhort the Duke of Berri to establish peace "for the honor and welfare of the king and the kingdom." The deputation was instructed to state that in the dissensions between the princes of the royal house the University wishes to act as "the loyal daughter of the king," to refrain from all partisanship, and to mediate by exhorting both parties to make peace, for it is her duty by reason of her profession (*ex sua professione*) to work for peace, "as she always has been accustomed to do."³ After their interview with the Duke of Berri the deputies requested the King to restore tranquillity by removing the heads of the two parties (the Dukes of Berri and Burgundy) from the government and by replacing them with men devoted to the public welfare. This proposition was accepted and carried out.⁴ In 1410 and again in 1412 the University implored the Duke of Burgundy to establish peace in the realm.⁵ It also sent delegates to various councils assembled to deliberate concerning terms of peace (for example, at Auxerre in 1412, at Pontoise in 1413, at Troyes in 1420, at Arras in 1435),⁶ and issued letters confirming or approving treaties of peace.⁷ In 1413, at a congregation of the University at which the Dukes of Guienne, Berri, and Burgundy, with many other magnates, were present, the chancellor of the Duke of Guienne solemnly rendered thanks to the assembled masters for having labored zealously to establish peace.⁸

During Charles VI.'s reign the rector and masters also exhibited much zeal for the improvement of the government of France. In 1405, in presence of the princes of the royal house, Gerson (*ex parte universitatis*) delivered an oration on the reformation of the chief

¹ *Chartularium*, IV. 135.

² *Ibid.*, IV. 160.

³ *Ibid.*, IV. 188. In 1432 and 1444 the University again asserts that "by reason of her profession" she strives for the peace and tranquillity of the realm. (*Ibid.*, IV. 547, 646.)

⁴ *Chronique du Religieux de Saint-Denis*, IV. 372-384; cf. Valois, *Le Grand Conseil*, 118-120.

⁵ *Chartularium*, IV. 189, 239-241; see also *ibid.*, IV. 547.

⁶ *Ibid.*, IV. 241, 259, 377, 565-571.

⁷ For example, in 1413 and 1420 (*ibid.*, IV. 259, 261, 380).

⁸ *Ibid.*, IV. 261.

branches of government, especially the king's council, the judiciary, the army, and taxation; he said that "the daughter of the king" is, as it were, the eye of France, which must always be vigilant for the welfare of the realm.¹ Again, in 1413, in presence of the King, Gerson indicated (*nomine universitatis*) how the evils of the past might be avoided and how the realm might be well governed in the future.² In 1413 the University took a very prominent part in the agitation which led to the adoption of the Cabochian Ordinance, the Magna Charta of medieval France;³ and in 1416 the rector and various doctors deliberated with the Parlement of Paris as to the measures which should be taken against evil-doers who pillage the king's subjects.⁴

The political activity of the University also manifests itself in the relations of France to foreign powers, especially to England. In 1412 the rector and masters write to the King that the English should be driven from the duchy of Normandy, which they have invaded; similar letters were sent to the Dukes of Guienne and Burgundy;⁵ and in 1418 the University beseeches the King and the Duke of Burgundy to relieve Rouen, which is besieged by the English.⁶ Soon afterwards, however, we find the rector and masters acting in sympathy with England. In 1420 they accepted the Treaty of Troyes, and in 1422 gave thanks because Henry V. had taken Melun from Charles VII.; in 1424 they celebrated the victories of the English over the French, and urged Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, to desist from his plan of warfare against the Duke of Burgundy because such warfare might endanger the union of France and England.⁷ The University also manifested much zeal in the persecution of Joan of Arc.⁸

After Charles VII. had succeeded in making headway against the English and in asserting his authority in France, it could not be expected that he should look with favor on the Parisian masters who had consorted with his enemies in the dark days preceding the advent of Joan of Arc. In the second half of his reign the University was no longer a power in the political life of France; and

¹ *Chartularium*, IV. 136; Schwab, *Gerson*, 417.

² *Ibid.*, IV. 261.

³ *Ibid.*, IV. 252-253, 257; Coville, *Les Cabochiens* (Paris, 1888). Coville, pp. 115-133, gives an interesting account of the political influence and political theories of the University.

⁴ *Chartularium*, IV. 320.

⁵ *Ibid.*, IV. 243-244.

⁶ *Ibid.*, IV. 357. The rector and masters also issued a proclamation calling upon the French cities to aid the King against the English, "the ancient enemies" of France (*Ibid.*, IV. 355-356).

⁷ *Ibid.*, IV. 380, 403, 435, 437; see also *ibid.*, IV. 413.

⁸ *Ibid.*, IV. 510-528. For the relations of the University to Henry V. and Henry VI. (1420-1437), see Jourdain, *Excursions Historiques*, 311-335.

in 1446 one of the bulwarks of its ancient independence was swept away by a royal edict which made the University subject to the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.¹ Another of the most precious academic privileges, exemption from taxation, was also assailed by that monarch.² While his son Louis XI. sat on the throne, "the eldest daughter" of the king was under stern parental control which would not brook any interference in political affairs. In 1467 Louis informed a deputation of the University that the old practice of meddling with the quarrels of princes must not be renewed,³ and there is no evidence that it was renewed during his reign. In 1483, when the rector and masters approved the treaty of peace between Louis XI. and Maximilian of Austria, they simply acted as the docile instrument of the crown: they had been commanded to give their approval to the treaty, and they answered that they were always "ready to do all that the king may be pleased to order."⁴ In 1485, during the minority of Louis XI.'s successor, Louis of Orléans asked the University for its support against Anne of Beaujeu, the regent of France, but it prudently refrained from interfering in the strife of factions.⁵ When Louis of Orléans became King of France he refused to recognize the right of the University to suspend its lectures and sermons, and hence in 1499 this ancient weapon of academic aggression was used for the last time.⁶ Thus under Charles VII. and his three successors the independence and influence of the great corporation of masters gradually declined, and the University ceased to be a political power.

Having determined the scope of its political activity, we are now prepared to deal with the causes which led the University to assert itself in politics. First it should be noted that the position of the rector and masters as an independent and privileged corporation, accustomed to self-government and free discussion, gave them a consciousness of strength and an aptitude for political agitation. Then, too, the situation of the University in a great capital brought the academic body in close touch with the political life of France. Moreover, this body was well adapted to diffuse political ideas and to mould public opinion; for its masters filled most of the pulpits in Paris and held many benefices in other parts of France.⁷ Therefore the approbation of the University was courted by the king and by the leaders of party factions. For example, in 1411 Charles VI.

¹ *Chartularium*, IV. 669.

² Beaucourt, *Histoire de Charles VII.*, IV. 326.

³ Du Boulay, V. 681.

⁴ *Ibid.*, V. 755-757.

⁵ *Ibid.*, V. 767; Crevier, IV. 417-419.

⁶ Du Boulay, V. 830-834; Dubarle, I. 337-339.

⁷ Rashdall, *Universities*, I. 421; cf. *ibid.*, I. 532-535; *Chartularium*, IV. 648.

complained that the Dukes of Berri and Orléans were trying to destroy his authority, and requested the rector and masters to cause this fact "to be published and preached in churches and elsewhere throughout the realm."¹

The various circumstances or considerations which we have thus far set forth do not suffice, however, to explain the political rôle of the University; they were simply conditions which would favor or facilitate the exercise of political power. In seeking the true explanation of this power, we must remember that the activity of the University in public affairs was largely confined to the reign of Charles VI.; in no other reign did the rector and masters take the initiative in secular politics. It is not surprising that during the disorders of the first quarter of the fourteenth century, when a mad king sat on the throne and the realm was rent asunder by party strife, the great school of Paris should exert its influence in behalf of peace and good government. It would feel impelled to do this by a mere sense of patriotic duty (*ex sua professione*); for the rector and masters held a high place in the religious and educational world, and their opinions on any subject would naturally receive attention. They were aroused to action by the appalling condition of things in France, by "the pitiable desolation of the realm," by "the iniquities intolerable and painful to the hearts of all good Frenchmen."² Moreover, the material welfare of the University and at times even its very existence seemed to be jeopardized by the struggle between the Burgundians and Armagnacs. In 1410 the rector informs the King that the University is inclined to abandon Paris, because, owing to the depredations of the troops of both factions, food cannot be provided and property is unprotected;³ and in 1418 the rector joins with the Parlement of Paris in a request that the King should take measures against these troops, in order that the necessities of life may not be wanting in Paris.⁴ Again, in 1412 the Dukes of Orléans and Berri tried, for political reasons, to secure the removal of the University from Paris.⁵ We should scarcely expect the rector and masters to remain passive when the body politic of France was paralyzed and the University itself was threatened with ruin.

The prominence of the University in the Great Schism may also have given an impulse to its activity in the affairs of the state. The

¹ *Chartularium*, IV. 219.

² *Ibid.*, IV. 188-189, 241, 259-260, 355.

³ *Ibid.*, IV. 191.

⁴ *Ibid.*, IV. 351. In 1410 the rector and masters complained of the desolate condition of Paris, and in 1418 deliberated with the Parlement concerning the lack of provisions and fuel in Paris (*ibid.*, IV. 189, 354).

⁵ *Ibid.*, IV. 235.

discord in the Church concerned the welfare of all the nations of western Europe; kings as well as prelates were interested in the strife between the rival popes. Throughout the struggle, therefore, we find all kinds of politics intermingled, religious and secular, national and international. The University, as a great organ of the Church, was soon engaged in making zealous efforts to bring the Schism to an end, but its zeal was often leavened by the flattery of princes. Thus in 1379 Charles V. virtually coerced the rector and masters to declare for Clement VII.; in 1381 the Duke of Anjou, the regent of France, opposed their efforts to promote harmony by means of a general council; in 1391 Charles VI. imposed silence upon them when they exhorted him to secure the union of the Church; in 1394 the King permitted them to find some way of ending the Schism, and appointed deputies to confer with them on this subject.¹ In 1381 a contemporary poet exhorts the king to allow the masters greater freedom of speech in the discussion of the Schism:

„ Roy, leisse seurement les clerks de Paris fere
Sermons, disputoisons au pour et au contraire.”²

In fact, at every stage of the great struggle secular as well as religious politics are visible, and in the conciliar movement the University, like a sovereign power, negotiates with the French crown, with the rival popes, and with continental princes. Now we venture to suggest that its efforts in behalf of peace and reform in the Church would naturally prepare the way for the exercise of its influence in behalf of peace and reform in the kingdom of France during the dark days of Charles VI.: the semi-secular activity of the rector and masters in church politics would predispose them to participate in the purely secular politics of France.

Thus the disorders of the time of Charles VI., which threatened the kingdom of France and the University of Paris with ruin, coupled with the prominent rôle which the latter had already played in ecclesiastical politics, sufficiently explain its prominent rôle in public affairs during the first quarter of the fourteenth century. If these disorders and the impotence of the crown had continued under Charles VII. and Louis XI., the University would probably have held its place as an important factor in the political life of the nation. As the weakness of the papacy gave the University the opportunity to assert its authority in the Church, so the weakness of the crown gave it the opportunity to assert its authority in the state.

CHARLES GROSS.

¹ *Chartularium*, III. 564, 583, 595, 603. For other illustrations see *ibid.*, III. 552-639; and Valois, *La France et le Grand Schisme* (2 vols., Paris, 1896).

² Valois, I. 350.

THE RISE OF METROPOLITAN JOURNALISM,

1800-1840

THE mechanical evolution of the modern newspaper is due chiefly to the steam-engine and the telegraph, but the evolution of the modern journalistic spirit is due chiefly to an aggressive democracy. Probably in no other country in the world has the press been so intimately connected with the inmost springs of the life of all political parties. No other nation has produced such a reading democracy as ours.

Democracy demands publicity. This great leveling force, pulling down on one side while it builds up on the other, is naturally hostile to any concealments and evasions of purpose or action. It scoffs at pretensions to esoteric wisdom. It revolts against secret machinations, as perilous to that régime of common consent which democracy calls "Law." From such reasons sprang those occasional popular frenzies against some secret fraternities, frenzies which shattered the Masonic order in 1829-1830, and which have buried the American, or Know-Nothing party, under forty years of obloquy. Upon the triumph of the democratic principle, therefore, the newspaper has been peculiarly dependent. It is, in theory at least, the very temple and shrine of Publicity. In fact, the newspapers, scattered throughout the body politic, act as lungs through which our system of representative party government draws most easily its vital breath.

To the mass of people the controllers of influential journals are the real managers of the great world's stage. They set the scene. They put the words into the players' mouths. They call attention to the moral which adorns the tale. "There's nothing," says the rattle-pated city editor in a recent story, "there's nothing like original news to show the influence of journalism. One morning, after the cakes had been bad for a week, I said to my landlady that I believed the fault must be in the buckwheat. She said 'No, she didn't think so, for the flour looked very nice indeed.' That day I put a line in the 'Local Glimpses' columns saying that unfortunately the buckwheat this year was of inferior quality. The very next morning she apologized to me, said I was right, the buckwheat was bad, she had read so in *The Chronicle*."

The expansion of democracy in the United States has found a constant index and gauge in the evolution of the newspaper. As democratic sentiment among us took form and produced the organs of political party life, the journals changed from mere bill-boards to party-organs, and from party-organs to newspapers, obedient finally to the demands of Publicity rather than to those of Party. Prior to 1830 every paper was intended to be the preacher of some partisan gospel. It was filled with personal squibs or stump-speeches and published such stray items of general news as fell easily into its possession.

Glancing back for an instant at the beginnings of journalism in the eighteenth century, we see at once that the colonial press was in no wise a framer or leader of public opinion. Those papers were its humble and passive channels. Neither were they newspapers in our sense of the term. They were bulletin-boards on which were plastered the political arguments or purposes of factions and parties. Provincial New York had more clearly antagonistic political parties than any other colony. The two parties, popular and aristocratic, were somewhat evenly balanced in New York City and each had its chosen journalistic organ since the first quarter of the eighteenth century. Bradford's *Gazette* was founded in 1729 to be the mouth-piece of the royal governors and of the aristocratic party; Zenger's *Journal* was established in 1733 to be the similar representative of the popular opposition. As the most favored Tory organ, Bradford's *Gazette* was succeeded in the decade 1750 to 1760 by Hugh Gainé's *Mercury*, and in the era of the Revolution by James Rivington's *Gazette*. The office of this paper was sacked and its types destroyed by a mob of Sons of Liberty, who would not permit freedom of the press except to their own publication. This paper, called Holt's *Journal*, was the direct successor of Zenger's *Journal*, and the proprietor, John Holt, was a prominent patriot and Son of Liberty. All these papers were weekly; the first daily paper in New York City was the *Daily Advertiser*, founded in 1785, of which the poet Freneau was for a short time the editor in 1789-1790.¹ The proprietor of Holt's *Journal* was now dead, but under different names and through some vicissitudes of fortune this paper remained true to its original political affiliations with radical democracy.

At the beginning of this century the New York City instrument of the Jeffersonian democracy was the lineal descendant and representative of Holt's paper. It was then called the *American Citizen*. Its editor was an Englishman named James Cheetham, a

¹ The first daily newspaper in the country was the *American Daily Advertiser*, issued at Philadelphia in 1784, and now merged in the paper known as the *North American*.

master of invective, who was proud to be called an American Junius. When the breach between Burr and the Clintons occurred in 1801, Cheetham became the scribe of the latter faction. He assailed Burr not only through the columns of the *Citizen* but by a running fire of anonymous pamphlets, charging upon Burr the crime of treachery to Jefferson and to the party in the late presidential election. The friends of Burr defended him in the *Morning Chronicle*, which they established in 1802 under the supervision of an elder brother of Washington Irving. This journal canonized Burr and denounced the ambitious oligarchy of Livingstons and Clintons.

The organ of the outgoing Federalist administration was the *Commercial Advertiser*, still in existence, the dean of the metropolitan daily newspapers. This paper had been founded in 1793 by Noah Webster, and had at first borne a classic name, the *Daily Minerva*, suggestive of its famous founder's Yale education. Alexander Hamilton and the Federalists who followed his fortunes also possessed a newspaper battery. This was the *Evening Post*, founded in 1801, and edited by William Coleman, a Massachusetts gentleman and a lawyer. He had been a municipal office-holder, but De Witt Clinton's new broom swept him out of office in August 1801, and the *Post* was established in the following November. The New York *Evening Post* owes its existence to the first application of the "spoils" theory in our political system. Mr. Coleman and Dr. Irving of the *Chronicle* were both men of erudition and scholarly tastes, but Irving could compete with neither Coleman nor Cheetham in spiteful vigor of expression. These gentlemen filled the small space reserved from advertisements with malicious paragraphs about each other, or with furious diatribes against the leaders of opposing parties. A few local chronicles and a bare summary of foreign news six or eight weeks old occasionally appeared. Jefferson's first message in 1801 was printed in the *Post* on the twelfth of December, 1801. It was in no wise referred to until the seventeenth, when some contributor, presumably Alexander Hamilton, hid behind the dignified Roman mask of "Lucius Crassus," and discharged a resounding volley at the message.

Cheetham and Coleman were soon embroiled, and Coleman wrote of "the insolent vulgarity of that base wretch." Duane, of the Philadelphia *Aurora*, was another of Coleman's antagonists, and on one occasion the latter hit both his birds with one stone, thus :

"Lie on, Duane, lie on for pay,
And Cheetham, lie thou too ;
More against truth you cannot say
Than truth can say 'gainst you."

The third corner of the triangular fight was well maintained, for although Dr. Irving was amiable, some of Burr's friends were equally ready with pen or pistol. The scurrilities of these faction-fights ripened into a harvest of duels. One day Matthew L. Davis, of Burr's Myrmidons, patrolled Wall Street, weapon in hand, expecting to slay Cheetham on sight. A challenge from Cheetham to Coleman led to a bloody fight between Coleman and Harbor-master Thompson in which the latter was shot to death.

None of these New York city papers wielded much influence outside of the city and its vicinity. The mentor of the Democratic Republican journals of the state was the *Albany Evening Register*. That paper had the advantage of location, for the state officers were residents at Albany and frequent contributors to the columns of the *Register*. It was the bulletin-board of the leading Clintonian politicians of the state. It was the paper which chiefly influenced members of the legislature while in session. Above all, its proprietors were sure of an income from the public printing. As for news, Albany or any other inland point was in those days almost as well situated as New York. There was no competition in the dissemination of the latest intelligence. Partisan information was desired, and in that department the *Register* could speak with authority.

When De Witt Clinton, covered with the reproach of his opposition to Madison in 1812, was cast out of the Republican synagogue, the *Register* fell with him into the outer darkness of "Clinton's big ditch." The new commanders of democracy, Martin Van Buren and others associated with Governor Tompkins, promptly established, January 26, 1813, a new paper called the *Argus*, to feed at the state printing crib, and to act as file-leader for all the orthodox Republican newspapers of the state. They selected as its editor a moderate and discreet man named Jesse Buel, who could be depended upon to obey orders. Any important proclamations were contributed directly by some member of the Regency, Marcy, Wright, Dix, or even by Van Buren himself. The country editors of the Bucktail faith scanned the *Argus* for the materials of leading articles in their weekly issues, and they accepted its opinions as inspired revelations. And they were. No man could become editor of the *Argus* unless he was acceptable to the Regency. "Without a paper thus edited at Albany," wrote Mr. Van Buren to Jesse Hoyt in 1823, "we may hang our harps on the willows. With it the party can survive a thousand convulsions." In that year the oracle was intrusted to the discretion of a young hierophant named Edwin Croswell. Mr. Croswell was

well adapted for the mysteries of political management. Although an unswerving partisan, he was cool and cautious in temperament. Sagacious judgment enhanced the value of his considerable executive abilities, and his contemporaries were surprised that a man, whose training had been purely practical, should infuse so much literary taste and skill into the acrimony and vulgarity of petty politics. Under the Croswell dynasty, which endured until 1855, the *Argus* touched the zenith of authority and influence. Mr. Edwin Croswell was admitted to the inmost circles of the Regency, and not even Mr. Van Buren himself was more cunning in the distribution of either commands or loaves and fishes. While Jackson and Van Buren sat on the throne, the *Argus* was one of a trio of party organs which represented the three chief centres of Democratic intrigue. Croswell in the *Argus* made known the will of the Albany Regency. Francis P. Blair in the *Washington Globe* spoke for the Kitchen Cabinet, and Father Thomas Ritchie, "old Momentous Crisis" Ritchie, displayed in the *Richmond Enquirer* the flag of the venerable Richmond Junta, the successors of Jefferson, Madison and Monroe. No triplet of party organs, before or since, exerted such unquestioned power. These papers, as Hudson says, "made cabinet officers and custom-house weighers, presidents and tide-waiters, editors and envoys. They regulated state legislatures and dictated state policies. They were the father confessors to the democracy of the country."

For the second or Whig Albany Regency Thurlow Weed's *Albany Evening Journal* was the accredited organ. The *Evening Journal* was never however the prompter of the Whig newspaper chorus as the *Argus* had been for their Democratic contemporaries. Neither did the machine of Seward and Weed ever obey the word of command so readily as Van Buren's. The Whig leaders directed a more intelligent, and consequently a less pliant party. The *Journal* enjoyed the advantage of the unique and powerful personality of its editor, Thurlow Weed, who was under no man's thumb and who wielded a far greater individual influence than Croswell of the *Argus* could ever claim.

Thurlow Weed and Edwin Croswell were together from 1830 to 1848 the foremost journalist-politicians in the state of New York. Side by side upon that Albany hill they patrolled the picket lines of their opposing hosts or sounded the reveille for the retainers of Seward or Van Buren. Weed's post was at once more honorable and more onerous. Croswell was at best only Van Buren's chief of staff, but no man could tell where Weed's power ended and Seward's began. Governor Seward's ornate eloquence and unerr-

ing phraseology fired the popular heart, but Weed held the workers in leash like a master of the hounds. He had become the master of a simple, direct, and powerful editorial style, but his influence depended little on his controversial paragraphs, pungent as they were. Personal acquaintance was his main reliance, and with habitual cleverness he made the columns of his newspaper contribute to these resources. There was a column in the *Evening Journal* in which Weed used to make personal mention of his friends and foes in short articles, varying from a line and a half to a dozen or fifteen lines in length. "That column," says Dyer, "was a prodigious power in the politics of the state of New York. There was seldom a young man in any part of the state, who gave promise of becoming a person of influence, that was not kindly and flatteringly mentioned in that column, no matter to what party he belonged." To the young and aspiring Whig politician, that kindly allusion in the most prominent newspaper of his party often seemed like a glowing promise that his humble merit should not lose its reward. The young Democrat also, who was revolving in the obscure orbit to which the Regency had appointed him, and who perhaps had believed both the *Evening Journal* and its editors to be of villainy all compact, was some day surprised and gratified to find that Weed had printed a flattering notice of him, in which regretful reference to his politics was mingled with admiring acknowledgment of his abilities. His opinion of the Whig leader and of the Whig paper changed rapidly. He mailed copies of the *Journal* to all his friends. Perhaps he called on Weed, and was received with winning cordiality. He concluded that his veteran foe was not so black as he was painted, and he returned home to wonder why the editor of the *Argus* was so much less clear-sighted than his rival of the *Journal*. All this strategy on Weed's part was surely not journalism, but it was excellent politics. By such means Weed obtained some power of manipulating the machinery of both parties, and his influence was the more valuable because it was so secret and intangible.

It was not and is not likely that journalist-politicians like Weed and Croswell could contribute much to the institutional development of the newspaper. They subordinated the journalist to the politician, as their predecessors had done before them, and the grinding of the party organ was sufficiently musical to their ears. But in the very heyday of their fame and vigor, a new spirit was beginning to move upon the waters especially in New York City.

The beginning of the second quarter of this century was a period of intellectual unrest and fermentation. In Europe there

was political revolution ; in this country there was Jackson's tumultuous democracy. Anti-Masonry, Abolitionism, and Transcendentalism were, all three, the tokens—and products too—of a great moral awakening. The foundations of social order seemed to be crumbling under the test of destructive criticism. The tablets of the old theology were ground to powder in Boston, and in New York the first of our workingmen's parties began its courageous attacks upon the laws of political economy. Saviors of society appeared here and there, impostors like Joseph Smith and Matthias, and apostles of humanity like Robert Owen. The socialistic seed sown in Europe by Saint-Simon, Cabet and Fourier took root upon our soil and finally produced a harvest of enthusiastic communities and phalanxes, harbingers of a new heaven and new earth wherein should dwell righteousness. These preliminary New Jerusalems usually forbade marriage, and then came Sylvester Graham, commanding to abstain also from meats and prophesying regeneration by the use of unbolted flour, oatmeal and beans. All this running to and fro increased an appetite for knowledge, and the men were already in existence who would re-organize the press to meet the new demands.

In the political world the crowd was newly emancipated from colonial and aristocratic traditions and laws, newly vocal with enthusiasm for a democratic hero, Old Hickory, and willing to pose before the rest of the world. A new conception of journalistic functions began to take shape. The newspaper must adapt itself to meet the crowd. It must become the representative of the multitude rather than a few. Even while the violence of partisanship did not abate, the former proportions of general news and of partisan propaganda were gradually reversed. In this evolution the journalist began to differentiate himself from the politician, and journalism began to emerge as a distinct profession.

It was natural that these changes should be most significant and interesting in the field of New York City journalism. Thanks to Martin Van Buren and Thurlow Weed, New York contained the best organized and most eager democracy in the Union. Thanks to the enterprise of its own business men, and subsequently to the policy of DeWitt Clinton, New York City had become the metropolis of the country, wherein the new journalism could find its best and largest audience.

The leading political papers in New York City in 1829 were the *Courier and Enquirer*, a Democratic sheet of the old-fashioned sort ; the *Journal of Commerce*, which may be described as " Adams Anti-Slavery ;" and the *Evening Post*, Jacksonian. The commer-

cial and advertisement bulletins, like the *Gazette* or the *Commercial Advertiser*, could count perhaps a larger circulation, which scarcely reached in either case a daily issue of two thousand copies; but these papers never aspired to represent public sentiment. For that honor, there was brisk competition between the *Courier and Enquirer* and the *Journal of Commerce*, both sixpenny morning papers, and both catering to the political tastes of the mercantile classes.

The *Evening Post* rested on a narrower basis. It was, as it has always been, the favorite of the small cultivated class, and it had already been immortalized by the famous "Croaker" literature of Fitz Greene Halleck and Joseph Rodman Drake. The paper passed in 1829 from the hands of the dying Coleman into the control of William Leggett and William Cullen Bryant. These two editors, both young and ardent, and both poets, were happily described in the columns of the *Courier and Enquirer* as "the chanting cherubs of the *Post*," a title which clung to them for years.

Under Mr. Bryant, who became the responsible editor in 1836, the *Post* naturally perfected that literary flavor which it had acquired from the doctrinaire Coleman and the brilliant Leggett. Mr. Bryant was neither a great journalist nor a politician. The force of the *Post* as a newspaper was small, and its political influence was necessarily limited. Mr. Bryant's best service to journalism was his consistent exposition of the ideals of a scholarly and cultivated gentleman; but his professional brethren and rivals were often angered by his didactic tone, and made unkind allusions to the phylacteries of the Pharisees.

Mr. Bryant's catholic moderation of judgment lent to his political opinions a noteworthy consistency in conservatism. To Van Buren democracy the *Evening Post* was attached without variableness or shadow of turning. Satisfied with the general principles of that party concerning free-trade, slavery and hard-money, Bryant and the *Post* blindly followed all the Van Burenite twistings throughout the Free Soil period, and finally fell with the rest of the anti-slavery democrats into the yet inchoate mass of the Republican party. Throughout the whole era of the war, it represented the sentiment of that democratic element in the new party. Since the war it has returned with that same clientage to its old political affinities, a most remarkable instance of permanence in the political relations of a metropolitan newspaper.

The *Courier and Enquirer*, in 1829, was the property of James Watson Webb, a wealthy, hot-headed young aristocrat, who would have been more congenially placed among the fire-eaters of the Palmetto State than in democratic New York. The possession

of pecuniary resources enabled Webb to command efficient service and thus the *Courier* acquired a dignity and importance to which the mercurial, impulsive temperament of the proprietor and senior editor was always the principal drawback. Col. Webb's West Point education did not tend to curb his ebullient spirits or to diminish his punctilious sensitiveness concerning his honor. The sword, the pistol, the walking-cane and the fist were all handier if not mightier weapons than the pen to him. Several times he assaulted the proprietor of the *Herald* in the street. More than once he journeyed post-haste to Washington to pull the nose or let the blood of some magnate who had breathed too carelessly upon the name of Webb. Only the interposition of Governor Seward's pardon in 1842 saved Webb from serving two years in the state's prison for fighting a duel on a Sunday with Hon. Thomas F. Marshall of Kentucky. The elaborate bombast and grandiloquence with which Webb described these encounters are among the most amusing reminiscences of New York journalism.¹

If Col. Webb's excitable energy could have been legitimately and sensibly directed in the field of his ostensible profession, he might have founded a great newspaper. Even as it was, a very considerable stimulus in newspaper enterprise was derived from him. The *Courier and Enquirer* entered into lively competition with the *Journal of Commerce* for the first possession of news from Europe. From 1830 to 1834 these papers kept fast-sailing schooners and clipper ships off Sandy Hook to intercept incoming steamers and to carry up the harbor if possible some "exclusive" news. The *Courier* and the *Journal of Commerce* during the years named spent from \$15,000 to \$20,000 a year on their news-schooners. Their rivalries occasionally contributed to the gayety of the town. Once when the clipper *Ajax* was about due from Europe, the *Courier* printed a postscript to the effect that the *Ajax* had come and brought news, a summary of which followed. A few copies were printed with this postscript and left at doors near the office of the *Journal of Commerce*. Watchers saw when one was "borrowed" and the others were taken up and destroyed. The *Courier's* regular edition was then printed without the postscript. The *Journal*,

¹ Witness the laborious elegance of his account of the famous assault upon Duff Green, editor of the *Washington Telegraph*: "After looking at him in silence for some seconds, I placed under my arm the walking-cane which I used, and leaned against the south jamb of the door, addressing him in the following terms which are still fresh in my recollection: 'You poor contemptible, cowardly puppy, do you not feel that you are a coward and that every drop of blood that courses through your veins is of the same kind of hue as your complexion? Contemptible and degraded as you are,' etc., etc, *ad libitum*."

however, was filled with "News by the *Ajax*." Everybody said, "The *Journal* is ahead of the *Courier* again," until the truth came out that the *Ajax* had not arrived, and then everybody laughed at the *Journal*. From 1833 to 1835 the two papers, under the initiative of Hale and Hallock, proprietors of the *Journal of Commerce*, organized daily pony expresses from Washington, but that experiment was too enterprising to endure.

The vitality of these papers was all expended in these spasmodic attempts to collect news and in a more serious effort to surpass each other in the size of their blanket sheets. They measured success by the square foot of white paper in a page, and this ludicrous contest absorbed their energies for years. The *Courier and Enquirer* plumed itself in 1850 on being 68 square inches larger than the London *Times* and on containing more than twice as many ems of printed matter. In March, 1853, the *Journal of Commerce* beat this record and measured $14\frac{1}{3}$ square feet to the sheet, which meant that each page of the journal contained $76\frac{1}{8}$ square inches more than a page of the *Courier*.

The tone of these journals was very stately, except when referring to each other. The political articles were long and labored, the references to current events were meagre and veiled in ample rhetoric. The same dignity characterized the business management. Papers were sold only over the counter or by the regular carriers. In those days, if Col. Webb had heard a ragged urchin bawling the name of the *Courier and Enquirer* in the streets, he would have cuffed the lad soundly for his presumption, and wondered what Machiavellian ingenuity had contrived this insult also. Annual subscriptions were universally accepted on a credit system and advertisements were inserted for a long time in advance on the same plan of payment. "The result was that so late as 1850, when New York City had a population of half a million, a sixpenny blanket sheet like the *Journal of Commerce* had a daily circulation of 4500, and Hallock thought that a yearly increase of 500 in that circulation was something to boast of."

James Watson Webb merited the laurels of Fame for the same reason that gave Louis XIV. the title of "Great," because of the eminent men whom he gathered around him. The *Courier and Enquirer* became the foster-mother of nearly all the bright young journalists of that generation, with the exception of Horace Greeley. Among these knights of the quill were Charles King, afterwards President of Columbia College, James K. Paulding, the novelist, afterwards Secretary of War, and Henry J. Raymond, the founder of the New York *Times*. But the most remarkable members of

Webb's group of lieutenants and associates were two men who entered his office in 1829 as part of the fixtures of the New York *Enquirer*. These were Mordecai Manasseh Noah and James Gordon Bennett. Major Noah's personality is more interesting to the psychologist than important to the historian. He was an Israelite, indeed, in whom there was much guile. Since 1816 he had been editor of the city organ of Tammany Hall, and an aspirant for various political offices, some of which he obtained. When he was a candidate for the shrievalty of New York City it was objected that a Jew ought not to be permitted to hang a Christian. "Pretty Christians," said Noah, "to require hanging at all!" Noah was a brilliant paragraphist, but too erratic and uneasy to make a durable impression in any calling. His vagaries touched occasionally on the verge of insanity, as when he attempted to gather all the lost tribes of Israel, among whom the Red Indians were to be included, into a new city on Grand Island in the Niagara River. Clad in a rich antique costume, he dedicated in September 1825, the corner-stone of the new Hebrew capital, and named the place "Ararat," in honor of his illustrious ancestor, the elder Noah.

The three men Webb, Noah, and Bennett, who were so closely associated in the conduct of the *Courier and Enquirer* in 1830, had not a few points in common. There was a dash of charlatantry in all three. They were alive to the mercantile value of sensationalism. They were all restless spirits, anxious to magnify their office, and all were half-conscious of an enormous waste of latent force somewhere in the operation of the newspaper institution. More than one enthusiast in the renaissance of 1830 had already perceived the power that the press could exert, if it could arrest the attention of a larger circle of readers. To achieve this, the paper must contain news that everyone would wish to read, and must be cheap enough for everyone to buy.

A suggestion of the possibilities in this direction was already offered by the *Illustrated Penny Magazine*, which was issued in London in 1830, and was sold in large quantities in New York and other cities. Journalism for the millions was felt to be in the air, although the *Illustrated Penny Magazine* was in no sense a newspaper. The *Bostonian* in Boston and the *Cent* in Philadelphia were feeble and short-lived attempts to put the product of the printing-press within the reach of all. The first penny paper of any considerable pretension was the *Morning Post* which began publication in New York City, January 1, 1833. Dr. H. D. Shepard, Horace Greeley, and Francis V. Story ventured to start the enterprise upon a capital of \$200 and a combined credit scarcely equal to the pur-

chase of \$40 worth of type. The paper was at first sold for two cents, but after the first week, the price was lowered to one cent. At that price the paper lived for just two weeks more. It would not deserve this mention but for its influence upon Greeley's subsequent success.

Out of all the various attempts to make a cheap newspaper that could live, only three succeeded, each after its kind, the *Sun*, the *Herald*, and the *Tribune*. The *Sun* was the pioneer. It was first issued, September 3, 1833, by Benjamin H. Day, an intelligent workingman, and a job printer by occupation. There had been several similar experiments during the preceding year, but they had all come to a speedy and untimely end. The *Sun* was the first penny newspaper that endured and it remained a penny sheet until 1861. It started with a circulation of 300. Its first issue contained twelve columns of matter, each column ten inches long. It was at the outset chiefly an advertising medium, and had no political influence. It scarcely made room at that time for financial or market items, or even editorial notes. It was filled with bits of local news and with advertisements for "Help Wanted," but this made it popular with the masses in search of employment. The first large increase of the visible radiance of the *Sun* was derived from the lively imagination of its editor, Richard Adams Locke.

One day in 1835, Mr. Locke, who had formerly been a reporter for the *Courier and Enquirer*, made some discoveries about the moon, wrote out the details, attributed the article to a "Supplement of the *Edinburgh Philosophical Journal*," and published the story as "filling" in the columns of the *Sun*. The article purported to describe discoveries made by Sir John Herschel at the Cape of Good Hope, and related by him to the *Edinburgh Journal*. Sir John was then at the Cape and had set up a new telescope there. The story ran that his telescope had revealed everything on the surface of the moon, and had discovered inhabitants, houses, soil, crops, animals, and modes of living. Everyone believed it at first, and everyone bought the *Sun* to read about it. The large papers were sadly deceived. The *New York Daily Advertiser* said "Sir John has added a stock of knowledge to the present age that will immortalize his name, and place it high on the page of science." Other papers claimed to have received the news as soon as the *Sun* did, but asserted that it had until now been crowded out by pressure of reading matter. The *Albany Advertiser* stated that it had read in an *Edinburgh scientific journal* an account of discoveries by Sir John Herschel, discoveries that filled the editor, so he said, with "unspeakable emotions of pleasure and astonishment." The *New York*

Herald finally exposed the hoax, but the reputation of the *Sun* was made, and Mr. Day introduced steam power into his printing-office in order to keep up with the demand. The *Sun* was the pioneer in this mechanical improvement, as well as in the publication of such gigantic "fakes."

Shortly afterward the *Sun* passed into the hands of the Beach family, who retained its management for thirty years, 1837-1868. The *Sun* in those early days did not aspire to be an intellectual force in the community. It never quite escaped from the predominant character of a "want" newspaper, but the results of its pecuniary success were far-reaching. Here was a paper which wore no party uniform, scarcely seemed to entertain any political preferences, was subsidized by no party managers, and yet in two years it had acquired a larger circulation than any of its contemptuous comrades could show. It reached the working-people as they never did, and within ten years it had prospered enough to command the best facilities for the transmission of news from distant points. It was still more of an advertiser than a newspaper, and it lacked the weight of any strong individuality, but it had answered its problem.

Quite different, much more efficient, but equally independent solutions were shortly afterwards offered by two observant journalists, James Gordon Bennett and Horace Greeley. James Gordon Bennett was completely described in Parton's clever phrase, as a "man with a French intellect and Scotch habits." He was a native of Scotland, and was born and educated amid Catholic surroundings, but even in youth the bonds of that faith rested very lightly upon him. He declared that the perusal of Franklin's autobiography sent him to America. In 1819, being about twenty years old, he landed at Halifax and gradually worked his way down the coast as far as Charleston, S. C. He picked up any job that came in his way, from school-teaching to reporting, but after 1823 he was steadily engaged in newspaper work in New York. His life in the South had inspired him with contempt for the negro slave and with admiration for the planter aristocracy, so that he naturally enlisted in the ranks of the conservative democracy. As reporter for the New York *Enquirer* in 1827 he wrote from Washington a series of gossip letters about public men and affairs at the national capital. These letters were avowedly modelled by him upon the letters of Horace Walpole and were the first professional efforts of the kind. They were written in the interest of Andrew Jackson, and of the Regency in New York, and they were then deemed graphic and amusing pictures of Washington life. Amusing they

certainly were, for after witnessing Jackson's inauguration, Bennett wrote that "Justice, with firmer grasp, secured her scales, 'Hope, enchanted, smiled,' and the Genius of our country breathed a living defiance to the world." "What a lesson," concluded Bennett, "for the monarchies of Europe!" Republican sentiments were still glittering with the charm of novelty to this young Scotchman, and his exuberance of imagination was not simulated. It was quite native and spontaneous. The process of disillusion followed speedily and was too rapid and extended for his moral health. He became a member of the Tammany Society and he became intimately associated with Webb and Noah. Nevertheless, so steadfast was he to the name and doctrine of democracy that he cut loose from Webb and Noah when they, in 1832, under strong suspicion of venality, abruptly abjured the Jackson faith.

The *Courier and Enquirer* became the leading organ of the party which Col. Webb first called "Whig," and Bennett was thrown out of employment. Bennett expected aid from the Regency for whom he had sacrificed himself. He seems to have had no further aim as yet than to become a political journalist like his neighbors and associates, and to await the rewards of partisan service. He made two shortlived attempts to establish a party organ, and in its behalf he wrote appealing letters to Hoyt and to Van Buren asking for loans of money. Van Buren, who was just then complaining to Hoyt that his newspaper chorus was too expensive, buttoned his pocket against James Gordon Bennett, and the other Regency politicians refused to help. These keen-witted men had discerned Bennett's volatile character. He was too elusive for them. He had even made fun of Croswell and he had not been obsequious enough regarding the Democratic policy concerning the deposits. So they passed him by on the other side, and thereby assisted to revolutionize our newspaper world.

Bennett had discovered that a paper which is universally denounced will be universally read. He had perceived that a democratic revival demanded a more democratic press, and his tough Scotch fibre was elastic enough to endure either pull or pressure. Stung by what he termed Van Buren's heartlessness, he determined to make a paper which should be the master of politicians, not their tool. To that purpose, despite all his frivolities and sinuosities, he clung with the tenacity of a Scotchman and the effrontery of a Frenchman. Moreover Bennett possessed in a high degree the ability which is at once the pride and bane of two-thirds of our so-called successful journalists to-day—the ability to write crisply, interestingly, and omnisciently about everything, including the things of which he knew nothing.

Out of the cellar at No. 20 Wall Street came the first copy of the *Daily Herald*, May 6, 1835, a little four-page penny paper, with four columns to a page. At the outset Bennett went straight to his mark. In the first place, his salutatory spoke of "principles, political party principles" as "steel-traps to catch the public." "We mean," wrote Bennett, "to be perfectly understood on this point, and openly disclaim all steel-traps, all principle as it is called, all party, all politics." A little later he made a plainer statement of his real political principles: "We have never been in a minority, and we never shall be." In other words his paper had become his party, and its pecuniary success his creed. To insure the triumph of that creed it was necessary that the *Herald* should voice the dominant sentiment of the day. Instead of preaching the gospel of one party in adversity and in success alike, as party organs did and do, the *Herald* must tread in the newest footmarks of shifting majorities. It might expostulate or satirize judiciously, but it must please. Thus the *Herald* was ordinarily a powerful expositor of Hunker democracy and it enjoyed a large circulation and influence in the South, yet in the two presidential campaigns in which the Whigs were successful the *Herald* kept in the van of the shouting multitude, first for "Tippecanoe and Tyler too," and afterwards for "Old Rough and Ready" Taylor.

Such was the first effect of triumphant democracy upon the press, as estimated by the most far-sighted journalist of that era. In the second place, the cheap papers, the *Sun* and the *Herald*, rejected the cumbrous credit system altogether. This cash system was tantamount to an emancipation from creditors, subscribers, and advertisers. The old cry of "Stop my paper" lost much of its terror.

In the third place, Bennett literally fulfilled his editorial promise to "give a picture of the world." He, first, in 1835, went on 'Change, note-book in hand, and wrote daily descriptions and reports of the stock markets. He first seized upon the opening of steam communication with Europe to organize upon that continent a bureau of foreign correspondence. He first in 1838 adopted the practice of reporting in full the proceedings of courts of law when cases of public interest were on the docket. In the same year he first began to publish in full the speeches of prominent public men in Congress and out of it. He vied with the elder papers in the race to meet the incoming ships from Europe, but when Bennett stationed his boats off Montauk Point and ran special locomotives over the Long Island Railway or even from Boston, his dignified contemporaries retired. He first in 1839 reported the proceedings of the religious

societies at their annual meetings. The good men and women at first regarded the reporter as a veritable serpent in the garden and sought to expel and exclude him, but they soon became reconciled to his presence.

In the fourth place, Bennett's editorial comments were always in the shape of short paragraphs filled with a strange but very readable mixture of common sense and impudence. In one of the first numbers he said: "The New York and Erie Railroad is to break ground in a few days. We hope they will break nothing else." This sarcasm was prophetic enough to make a reputation for any oracle. Again, the Presbyterian denomination was covered with the dust of a ponderous doctrinal controversy between Old School and New School. Bennett put the whole altercation under his microscope with a quiet remark which scarcely concealed the size of his chuckle: "Great trouble among the Presbyterians just now. The question in dispute is whether or not a man can do anything towards saving his own soul." At another time he referred to "the holy Roman Catholic Church," adding in a parenthesis "all of us Catholics are devilish holy." In 1840 when Bishop Hughes and Governor Seward tried to get public money for Catholic schools and thereby caused the formation of the Native American party, Bennett and the *Herald* were violent opponents of the Bishop's schemes, and Bennett said that his Reverence was trying to organize his church into a political club. The public had no appetite for the long-winded essays by "Publius" and "Honestus" and "Veritas" in the stately blanket sheets, when it could feed on such crisp criticism as this.

In the fifth place, Mr. Bennett's newspaper was quite emancipated also from the accepted standards of conventionality, one might almost say of ethics. He knew better than any of his rivals the pecuniary value of wholesale advertisement and his cold-blooded manner of translating notoriety into dollars and cents shocked the chivalrous soul of James Watson Webb. According to Webb's catechism gentlemen whose statements were too sharply criticized or whose motives were impugned could discover a healing balm only in an invitation to shed blood. Bennett laughed at such conduct and laughed also at such provocations. Every attack upon him was duly chronicled in the *Herald* and made a fresh means for exalting the horn of the newspaper and for extending its circulation. Bennett was assaulted on the street and in his office by those whom he censured and lampooned. Infernal machines were sent to blow him into atoms. Bennett answered with blows of ridicule and the public laughed with him and swelled the revenues of the *Herald*

still more. Demos would buy and read the paper if it amused him, and so Bennett played the fool as well as the omniscient vizier to his majesty, the public.

The audacious vanity and vulgarity with which he paraded his own private affairs before his readers kept the light-minded portion of the community in a guffaw and alert to know what Bennett would do next. At one time he discourses thus: "Amid all these thronging ideas hurrying across the mind, crowds of feelings fresh from the heart, and projects of the fancy stealing on the heels of each other as if by enchantment, there is one drawback, there is one sin, there is one piece of wickedness of which I am guilty, and with which my conscience is weighed down night and day; I am a bachelor." Some time later he announced his engagement in a leading article under these headlines in flaming type: "To the readers of the *Herald*—Declaration of Love—Caught at last—Going to be married—New Movement in Civilization." The first and last stanzas of the wild rhapsody that follows are these: "I am going to be married in a few days. The weather is so beautiful, times are getting so good; the prospects of political and moral reform so auspicious that I cannot resist the divine instinct of honest nature any longer. . . . I cannot stop in my career. I must fulfill that awful destiny which the Almighty Father has written against my name in the broad letters of life against the wall of heaven. . . . My ardent desire has been through life, to reach the highest order of human excellence by the shortest possible cut. Association, night and day, in sickness and in health, in war and in peace, with a woman of this highest order of excellence must produce some curious results in my heart and feelings, and these results the future will develop in due time in the columns of the *Herald*. Meantime I return my heartfelt thanks for the enthusiastic patronage of the public, both of Europe and of America. The holy estate of wedlock will only increase my desire to be still more useful. God Almighty bless you all. James Gordon Bennett."

The freedom with which the *Herald* related the annals of police courts and the particularity with which it recited scandals caused the greatest offense. The elder generation regarded Bennett as one who feared not God nor regarded man. Clergymen denounced him from the pulpit. Good men shook their heads over the prosperity of the *Herald* as an ominous sign of the times, and then read it to see what new iniquity it had been guilty of. "We can well remember," says Parton, "when people bought the *Herald* on the sly and blushed when they were caught reading it; and when the man in a country place who openly subscribed for it intended by that act dis-

tinctly to enroll himself among the ungodly." Four classes in the community denounced the *Herald*: the managers of the old papers and the politicians, for obvious reasons; the stockbrokers because of the financial articles in the *Herald*; and the clergy, because of Bennett's sensationalism and open rejection of sectarian restrictions. "We defy," wrote Bennett, "the bigots of Catholicity or of Protestantism. Like Luther, like Paul, we go on our own hook." Relying on the sentiment of these four classes, the ponderous battery of the sixpenny papers, headed by the *Courier and Enquirer*, the *Journal of Commerce* and the *Evening Post* began "the moral war" against the *Herald*. They undertook to create a public sentiment against Bennett which would kill his paper. They boycotted it, and used the utmost personal and corporate influence to banish the paper from hotels and reading-rooms and to frighten away its advertisers. Webb, for instance, wrote of the "moral leprosy and revolting blasphemy of the vile sheet of that unprincipled adventurer and vulgar, depraved wretch." Mr. Park Benjamin, who was then editing a little evening paper, the *Signal*, now quite forgotten, surpassed Webb and Noah together in the abundance of his picturesque objurgation. He managed to call Bennett an "obscene foreign vagabond, a pestilential scoundrel, ass, rogue, habitual liar, loathsome and leprous slanderer and libeller." The principal support that this "moral crusade" received in the community came from the politicians of the Van Buren machine, who were eager to punish Bennett for his bitter opposition to Van Buren's re-election. The Van Buren newspapers were the most malevolent in the use of scurrilous personalities, and one of their favorite titles, "Cross-eyed vagabond," elicited from Bennett a resort in the manner of his happiest impudence. "It is true," he wrote, "that I am thus handicapped, but my visual obliquity was caused by my earnest endeavors to watch the winding ways of Martin Van Buren."

The only really sufficient pretext for this holy war was the depraved avidity with which Bennett had seized upon bits of scandal and hurried them into print in order to attract readers, even at the risk of debauching them. But even in this wickedness the *Herald* had not been a sinner above most of the other Galilaeans, unless it were worse to peddle scandal at two cents a bucket than to sell it for six cents. But not even Bennett needed to point out the ludicrousness of men like Webb and Noah in the garb of moral censors and guardians of virtue. There was a revulsion of sentiment in favor of the paper which seemed to have no friends.

Three well-known politicians and merchants called one morning upon Mr. E. K. Collins, afterwards the owner of the famous Collins

line of steamers, and, adverting to the bad character of the *Herald*, began to allude to Mr. Collins's advertisements in that paper. "Yes, yes," replied Mr. Collins, in his quick, decided tone, "yes, yes, I understand. Charles," calling to a clerk in another room, "how many advertisements have we in the *Herald* this morning?" "Three, sir," answered the polite Charles. "Three, yes, yes. Well, Charles, put in three more to-morrow morning." Then, turning to the committee, he said: "That is my answer, gentlemen, good morning."

Amid all the clamor Bennett as usual kept his temper, and replied only with jocose sallies. He generally referred to his opponents as "The Holy Alliance," and gravely thanked them for giving him so much valuable advertisement. He was obliged to enlarge the *Herald*, and its circulation considerably exceeded that of all his enemies combined. The complete pecuniary success of both the *Herald* and the *Sun* proved to be an impregnable defense. The Holy Alliance gradually disbanded and a host of imitators of both the *Sun* and the *Herald* sprang up in New York and in other cities. Most of them met an early death, but a few repeated the history of their models, as the *Herald* in Boston, the *Ledger* and the *Sun* in Philadelphia, and the *Sun* in Baltimore. In connection with the *Ledger* and the *Baltimore Sun*, the *New York Herald* established the famous pony express from Mobile to Montgomery during the Mexican War, by which all the details of that war appeared in those journals before they were received by the authorities at Washington. This exploit destroyed all that was left of the Holy Alliance, and its principal members were glad to join in 1849 to 1851 with the *Herald* in the combination for newsgetting which is now known as the New York Associated Press. That was Bennett's triumph. The institution of the Press submitted then and there to the rule of Publicity and in her service acquired that irresponsible power which we can now neither restrain nor endure.

The old fashioned party-organs accommodated themselves to the new gospel with varying fidelity and with varying success. The *Courier and Enquirer* lingered along in a semi-comatose state until 1861, when it was buried in that mausoleum of dead newspapers, the New York *World*. The *Journal of Commerce*, last of the blanket sheets, pursued the even tenor of its way among the counting-rooms, almost unnoticed by the large world, until its non-resistant ultra-Democratic doctrines in 1861 brought it some unprofitable notoriety. This was a strange fate for a paper which thirty years before, under the same proprietors, had been regarded as an Abolition sheet.

Independent journalism, as represented first by the *Sun* and *Herald*, had won a complete victory over old-fashioned partisan journalism. The time had forever departed when an Albany Regency could tune the press of the state as easily and simply as Queen Elizabeth used to tune the English pulpits. The partisan editor could no longer expect to rule as absolutely over the political opinions of his readers as the priest had once ruled over men's religious opinions. As James Parton phrased it, "An editorial is only a man speaking to men; but the news is Providence speaking to men." For good or for ill, the victory of Bennett's *Herald* came to mean this exaltation of fact over opinion; it meant the recognition of journalism as a profession, as a profession with an end and aim in itself alone, utterly separate from merely political or religious purposes. That victory of Bennett's *Herald* helped to introduce into the world an ideal of devotion to journalism, *i. e.*, to truth-telling for its own sake, to which neither Bennett nor his paper could ever lay serious claim.

Bennett was often little better than a mountebank; his channel of truth discharged its contents without discrimination, sometimes clear water and sometimes the filth of a sewer. The stream cannot rise higher than its source; and no newspaper can be better than its dominant mind. We may regret that the cultured Bryant did not assume the prerogative of holding the mirror up to nature, did not transform the *Evening Post* into a keyboard across whose surface ran all the wires of human thought and passion. But the stubborn fact remains that the unmoral Bennett had this capacity for successful enterprise and had shaken off every ambition but the journalistic one. The virtuous Bryant had neither the capacity for such enterprise nor the freedom from distracting bondage to two or even more masters.

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

SHERMAN'S MARCH TO THE SEA

IN October, 1864, soon after he had evacuated Atlanta, Hood began a movement on Sherman's communications and broke up the railroad in his rear. He marched west and reached Gadsden, Alabama, October 20. He shunned a battle with Sherman, who was eager to bring one on, but Hood did not trust his troops, so impaired were their fighting qualities. In getting into the rear of the Union army he had made an adroit and audacious movement causing irritation to Sherman and anxiety to the authorities in Washington which was increased by his eluding the pursuit of the Federal commander. Leaving one corps in Atlanta Sherman began his march northward with the rest of the army October 4; on the twentieth he was at Gaylesville, Alabama. "The month of October closed to us looking decidedly squally," writes Sherman. He had already sent Thomas to Nashville to protect Tennessee while he studied and reflected how he might checkmate Hood. He decided on a march through Georgia to the sea and endeavored to obtain Grant's consent to this plan.

October 30, Hood began to cross the Tennessee river with the intention of invading Tennessee. This caused Grant apprehension, which was allayed by the reasoning of Sherman, and finally Grant sent him a despatch saying "Go as you propose."

The march to the sea, the advance northward from Savannah, and the operations of Thomas in Tennessee, are a combination of bold and effective strategy, only possible after the Chattanooga-Atlanta campaign and a fit sequel to it. A hundred persons may have conceived the design of marching to the ocean but the genius of the general lay in foreseeing the possible moves of his adversary, in guarding against them and in his estimate of the physical and moral result of cutting the Confederacy in twain. Not underrating the venture, wise in precaution, Sherman showed the same boldness and tenacity as Grant in his Vicksburg campaign in sticking to his purpose when others shook their heads. No general, who lacked qualities of daring and resolution, would have persisted in his determination to advance through Georgia after Hood had crossed the Tennessee river, especially when Grant for a time doubted the wisdom of the movement. As he was the commander,

knew his men and comprehended the conditions, he could lay no claim to success unless Thomas should defeat Hood. Therein, as the affair turned out, lay the risk. Sherman knew Thomas through and through. Classmates at West Point they had ever since been friends, and this friendship was cemented during the vicissitudes of the Civil War despite their differences of opinion proceeding from their diverse temperaments. Sherman had implicit confidence in Thomas, thought that he had furnished him a force sufficient for all emergencies and that the defense of Tennessee was not left to chance. "If I had Schofield," Thomas wrote Halleck, November 1, "I should feel perfectly safe." Sherman detached Schofield's corps from his army and sent it northward with instructions to report to Thomas for orders. On the day that Sherman started for the sea Thomas telegraphed to him: "I have no fear that Beauregard [Hood] can do us any harm now, and if he attempts to follow you, I will follow him as far as possible. If he does not follow you I will then thoroughly organize my troops and I believe I shall have men enough to ruin him unless he gets out of the way very rapidly." The opinion of the able and experienced critics, Mr. Ropes and General Schofield, who maintain that Sherman should have given Thomas more men, are refuted by the statements of Sherman and Thomas themselves. Nor must it be forgotten that the Union commanders were at this time uncertain whether Hood would follow Sherman or move north toward Nashville. The conferences between Beauregard, the commander of the Department, and Hood, and Davis's despatch to Hood, which have since been disclosed, attest the wisdom of anticipation and the preparedness for contingencies on the Union side. While Hood before the end of October had won Beauregard's consent to his plan of invading Tennessee, Jefferson Davis was not of the same mind. His telegram of November 7 (which however was not received by Hood until the twelfth) lacks a degree of positiveness and is interpreted differently but there is little doubt that he meant to disapprove an advance into Tennessee before Sherman had been defeated. As events happened the army that marched to the sea was unnecessarily large and 10,000 more men with Schofield might have saved some trial of soul. Nevertheless, as things looked at the time, Sherman must be sufficiently strong to defeat Hood and the scattered forces of uncertain number which would gather to protect Georgia. Moreover, as his ultimate purpose was to "re-enforce our armies in Virginia," he must have troops enough to cope with Lee until Grant should be at his heels. He reckoned that the force left in Tennessee was "numerically greater" than Hood's.

Considering everything that could have been known between November 1 and 12 it seems clear beyond dispute that he made a fair division of his army between himself and Thomas.

Deliberation, care and foresight marked the thoughts of Sherman as he reviewed his decision; up to within six days of his start southward he held himself ready in a certain contingency to co-operate with Thomas in the pursuit of Hood, the one moving directly against the Confederates and the other endeavoring to cut off their retreat, for it was ever clear to his mind that "the first object should be the destruction of that army," but as the days wore on the advantages of the march to the sea outweighed those of any other plan and the irrevocable step was taken. Stopping at Cartersville, November 12, on his progress southward he received Thomas's last despatch, acknowledged it and replied "all right;" a bridge was burned severing the telegraph wire and all communication with Thomas and his government. Like Julian who "plunged into the recesses of the Marcian or Black forest," the fate of Sherman was for many days "unknown to the world." No direct intelligence from him reached the North from November 12 to December 14. "I will not attempt to send couriers back," he had written to Grant, "but trust to the Richmond papers to keep you well advised." For these thirty-two days Lincoln and Grant had no other information of this important movement than what they gleaned from the Southern journals.

Sherman's imagination was impressed vividly with the strangeness of the situation: "two hostile armies were marching in opposite directions, each in the full belief that it was achieving a final and conclusive result in a great war." It would be impossible to show an entire consistency in the utterances of this great general; at times one aspect of the campaign appeared to him to the exclusion of another, and as he was given to fertile thought and fluent expression the idea uppermost in his mind was apt to come out. As with almost all men of action, the speculation of to-day might differ from that of yesterday and vary again to-morrow, yet this did not impair a capacity to make a correct decision nor steadfastness in the execution of a plan. Grant, more reticent and not expansive, is not chargeable in the same degree with inconsistency in his written words. He lacked imagination and was not given to worry. When any comparison is made between the two, the remark attributed to Sherman is pat as indicating the different manner in which they seem to look a situation in the face. "Grant does not care for what he cannot see the enemy doing and it scares me."

While the army was concentrating at Atlanta, the railway station, machine-shops, and other buildings of that city useful to the enemy in its military operations were destroyed. The right wing and one corps of the left wing having started the day before, Sherman rode out of Atlanta November 16 with the Fourteenth Corps; he had in all 62,000 "able-bodied, experienced soldiers, well armed, well equipped and provided, as far as human foresight could, with all the essentials of life, strength and vigorous action." One of the bands happening to play "John Brown's body lies a-mouldering in the grave," the men sang the well-known song, giving to the chorus "Glory, glory hallelujah, his soul is marching on," a force and spirit full of meaning as their minds reverted to the events which had taken place since that December day in 1859 when he, who was now a saint in their calendar, had suffered death on the scaffold. When the march to the sea began, the weather was fine, the air bracing and the movement to the south and east exhilarated the men. Many of the common soldiers called out to their general, "Uncle Billy, I guess Grant is waiting for us at Richmond." "There was a 'devil-may-care' feeling pervading officers and men," relates Sherman, "that made me feel the full load of responsibility." The tale of the march is not one of battle and inch-by-inch progress as was the campaign from Chattanooga to Atlanta. "As to the 'lion' in our path," wrote Sherman after he had reached Savannah, "we never met him." "In all our marching through Georgia Hardee [the Confederate commander] has not forced me to use anything but a skirmish line." Officers and men looked upon the march as a "picnic," "a vast holiday frolic." The burden was on the general in command. He was in the enemy's country; he must keep this large army supplied. Two critics, Mr. Ropes and Colonel Henry Stone, who have not a high opinion of Sherman's tactics on the battlefield, testify to his skill in handling an army on the march and to his foresight and care in providing it with food and munitions of war. When the army set out it had approximately supplies of bread for twenty days, sugar, coffee, and salt for forty and about three days' forage in grain; it had also a sufficient quantity of ammunition; all this was carried in 2500 wagons with a team of six mules to each. Drovers of cattle, enough to insure fresh meat for more than a month, were part of the commissariat. The ambulances were 600 in number; the artillery had been reduced to 65 guns. Pontoon trains were carried along as the invading host had many rivers to cross. The right wing was composed of the Fifteenth and Seventeenth Corps, the left wing of the Fourteenth and Twentieth; each corps marched on a separate road. The

division of the wagon trains gave each corps about 800 wagons, which occupied on the march five miles or more of road. The artillery and wagons with their advance and rear guards had the right of way, the men taking improvised paths at their side. The troops began their daily march at dawn and pitched their camp soon after noon, having covered ordinarily ten to fifteen miles. Milledgeville, the capital of the state, was reached by the left wing in seven days. This march through the heart of Georgia alarmed the Confederates lest either Macon or Augusta or both might be attacked, with the result that they divided their forces; and when it became clear that Savannah was the place on the sea aimed at it was impossible for various reasons to concentrate a large number of troops for defense. By December 10 the enemy was driven within his lines at Savannah; the march of 360 miles was over; the siege began.

In the special field order of November 9 it was said, "The army will forage liberally on the country during the march." As the state was sparsely settled and the plan of making requisitions on the civil authorities therefore impracticable, this was the only possible mode of supplying the troops. The arrangements for the foraging were made and carried out with military precision. Each brigade sent out a party of about fifty men on foot who would return mounted, driving cattle and mules and hauling wagons or family carriages loaded with fresh mutton, smoked bacon, turkeys, chickens, ducks, corn meal, jugs of molasses and sweet potatoes. The crop having been large, just gathered and laid by for the winter, the section never before having been visited by a hostile army, the land was rich in provisions and forage. While Sherman was maturing the plan of his march to the sea, he wrote to Halleck: "The people of Georgia don't know what war means but when the rich planters of the Oconee and Savannah see their fences and corn and hogs and sheep vanish before their eyes they will have something more than a mean opinion of the 'Yanks.' Even now our poor mules laugh at the fine cornfields and our soldiers riot on chestnuts, sweet potatoes, pigs and chicken." While Sherman and his officers labored sincerely to have the foraging done in an orderly way the men often took food on their own account in a riotous manner. The general himself relates this incident occurring on the march between Atlanta and Milledgeville: "A soldier passed me with a ham on his musket, a jug of sorghum-molasses under his arm and a big piece of honey in his hand, from which he was eating, and, catching my eye he remarked *sotto voce* and carelessly to a comrade, 'Forage liberally on the country,' quoting from my general orders." Sher-

man reproved the man as he did others when similar acts of lawlessness fell under his observation, explaining that "foraging must be limited to the regular parties properly detailed." Full of pride in his soldiers and elated at their manifestations of confidence in him, he gave when the march was completed this mild report of their infractions of discipline: "A little loose in foraging, 'they did some things they ought not to have done.'" A spirit of fun pervaded the army which exhibited itself in innocent frolics, the most typical of which was the meeting of some of the officers in the Hall of Representatives at Milledgeville where they constituted themselves the Legislature of the State of Georgia, elected a speaker, and after a formal debate repealed by a fair vote the Ordinance of Secession.

Destruction was a part of the business of the march. Lee's army drew its supplies of provisions largely from Georgia. "The State of Georgia alone," said Jefferson Davis in his speech at Augusta, "produces food enough not only for her own people and the army within it, but feeds too the Army of Virginia." It became of the utmost importance to sever the railroad communication between the Gulf States and Richmond and to this Sherman gave his personal attention. The bridges and trestles were burned, the masonry of the culverts was blown up. In the destruction of the iron rails mechanical skill vied with native ingenuity in doing the most effective work. The chief engineer designed a machine for twisting the rails after heating them in the fires made by burning the ties: this was used by the Michigan and Missouri engineers. But the infantry, with the mania for destruction which pervaded the army, joined in the work, carrying the rails, when they came to a red heat in the bonfires of the ties, to the nearest trees and twisting them about the trunks or warping them in some fantastic way so that they were useless except for old iron and the old iron even was in unmanageable shape for working in a mill. About 265 miles of railroad were thus destroyed. This in the heart of Jeff Davis's empire, as Sherman called it, was an almost irreparable damage owing to the lack of factories which could make rails for renewals and to the embargo on imports by the blockade of the Southern ports. Stations and machine-shops along the lines were burned. Many thousand bales of cotton, a large number of cotton-gins and presses were destroyed. At Milledgeville Sherman reports: "I burned the railroad buildings and the arsenal; the State House and Governor's mansion I left unharmed." The penitentiary had been burned by the convicts before the arrival of the army. At Millen the soldiers by orders applied the torch to

"the very handsome depot, railroad hotel and three or four large storehouses." A negro from whom Sherman asked information regarding the operations of the right wing, thus described what he had seen: "First there come along some cavalymen and they burned the depot; then come along some infantry men and they tore up the track and burned it; and just before I left they sot fire to the well." It was the policy of the general to forbear destroying private property, but in one important case he deviated from the rule. Stopping for the night at a plantation he discovered to belong to Howell Cobb, Buchanan's Secretary of the Treasury, he sent back word to the corps commander, "spare nothing." In nearly all of his despatches after he reached the sea he gloated over the destruction of property, giving in the one to Halleck the most emphatic statement of the damage which had been done. "We have consumed the corn and fodder in the region of country thirty miles on either side of a line from Atlanta to Savannah as also the sweet potatoes, cattle, hogs, sheep and poultry, and have carried away more than 10,000 horses and mules as well as a countless number of their slaves. I estimate the damage done to the State of Georgia and its military resources at \$100,000,000; at least \$20,000,000 of which has inured to our advantage and the remainder is simple waste and destruction. This may seem a hard species of warfare but it brings the sad realities of war home to those who have been directly or indirectly instrumental in involving us in its attendant calamities." Well might he say afterwards, "War is hell."

Various orders given from time to time show that there was not only lawless foraging but that there was an unwarranted burning of buildings. A more serious charge against the men of this Western army is pillage. Sherman admits the truth of it and so does General Cox. Since the end of the campaign Sherman had heard of jewelry being taken from women and is of the opinion that these depredations were committed by parties of foragers usually called "bummers." Cox dubs with that name the confirmed and habitual stragglers to whom he ascribes a large part of the irregular acts. Some of the pilfering was undoubtedly due to the uncontrollable American desire for mementos of places visited which were connected with great events. Moreover while three and one half years of civil war had built up an effective fighting machine, they had caused a relaxation in the rules of right conduct among its members so that it had come to be considered proper to despoil anyone living in the enemy's country; but there was a sincere desire on the part of the commander and his officers to restrain the soldiers

within the limits of civilized usage. The lofty personal character of most of the men in high command and the severity of the punishment threatened for breaches of discipline are evidence of this; and at least one soldier for a petty theft was sentenced "to be shot to death by musketry." Nor must it be overlooked that there was considerable plundering by bands of Confederates which people were prone to charge against Sherman's men. From the characterization of the Union officers one notable exception must be made. Kilpatrick, the commander of the cavalry, was notorious for his immorality and rapacity, and his escapades, winked at by Sherman on account of his military efficiency, were demoralizing to the army at the time and have since tended to give it a bad name. While extenuating nothing it is a gratification to record some words of Sherman which must be read in the light of his honesty of soul and truthfulness of statement. "I never heard," he wrote, "of any cases of murder or rape."

Sherman's campaign struck a blow at slavery. Everywhere the negroes received the Northern soldiers with joy. Near Covington an old gray-haired negro said to Sherman that he "had been looking for the angel of the Lord ever since he was knee-high" and he supposed that the success of the Northern army would bring him freedom. Another who was spokesman for a large number of fellow slaves said to an aide-de-camp of the General: "Ise hope de Lord will prosper you Yankees and Mr. Sherman, because I tinks and we all tinks dat you'se down here in our interests." At Milledgeville the negroes in their ecstasy shouted "Bress de Lord! tanks be to Almighty God, the Yanks is come! de day ob jubilee hab arribed!" "Negro men, women and children joined the column at every mile of our march," reported General Slocum who commanded the left wing. "I think at least 14,000 of these people joined the two columns at different points on the march, but many of them were too old and infirm and others too young to endure the fatigues of the march and were therefore left in the rear. More than one half of the above number however reached the coast with us." The desire to realize their freedom at once was keen, and the number would have been far greater had not Sherman discouraged the negroes from following the army, as all but the young and able-bodied who were put to use were a serious drawback from increasing the number of mouths to be fed, and from the constant apprehension lest they might hamper the movements of the troops in the event that the enemy in formidable array was encountered. But the tidings that President Lincoln had proclaimed them all free was spread far and wide.

Hardee found his position in Savannah untenable and on the night of December 20 evacuated it. Sherman took possession of the city and sent his celebrated dispatch to President Lincoln, who received it opportunely on the evening of Christmas day. "I beg to present to you," the general said, "as a Christmas gift the city of Savannah with 150 heavy guns and plenty of ammunition and also about 25,000 bales of cotton."

JAMES FORD RHODES.

FRENCH EXPERIENCE WITH REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN THE WEST INDIES¹

THE problem of representative government in tropical colonies is beset with extraordinary difficulties, which are crying for solution just at present, when so many important colonial establishments have been founded in those regions. The simplest method of solving the question, that of entrusting the administration to the discretion of tried officials, as is done in the English crown colonies, does not satisfy the political aspirations of the residents in the colonies and also runs counter to the ideal of government by consent, and of the political and moral amelioration of the natives. In case a representative council is established, in order to give opportunity for the expression of the political will of the inhabitants, it may be based either upon a restricted election or upon manhood suffrage. The latter solution has been tried only in the French tropical colonies. There the councils-general have been given real legislative power and are not merely advisory as in the English crown colonies. Moreover, the governor, while not legally responsible to the council, is nevertheless forced ultimately to yield to its will, on account of its power to refuse certain important appropriations.

The French West Indies are the best imaginable field for political assimilation ; the conditions which may be regarded as rendering that policy difficult or impossible are absent in the Antilles. There are two such contingencies : either, the population is so abjectly barbarous or decadent that even the rudimentary facts of a higher civilization cannot be understood by it ; or it has a long-established social order, and its traditional religion, customs and political institutions lead it to resist assimilation to an alien society, as is the case in countries like Siam, Burma, and Cambodia. Neither contingency applies to the West Indies.

The black and colored population of Martinique, originally recruited from various parts of Africa, has through the long era of slavery lost most of the connection with its older life. When the patriarchal organization of slavery was abolished in 1848, it became to a certain extent an atomistic society upon which assimilation could work with full force. Moreover, the colored population is

¹ Paper read before the American Historical Association, December 28, 1900.

itself desirous of becoming more and more like the former masters. The negroes of the French Antilles are in a distinctly favorable position, being in full possession and enjoyment of all the political rights of French citizens. They are not *de facto* disfranchised as in the United States, nor have they relapsed into savagery as have the blacks in the interior of Hayti. The French islands are therefore perhaps the best field for a study of the political capacity and the social tendencies of a colored population which is allowed to govern itself after republican models.

The importance of the political history of these islands becomes still greater when we consider that they have been practically the model for French colonial organization and legislation up to the present. All French dependencies were looked upon as colonies, and the theories which in the enthusiasm of the Revolution had been applied to the small French colonies of that time were extended to the large possessions acquired after 1870. The Antilles and Guiana are the last remnant of a vast empire in America and as such have always been treated with much liberality and favor. Moreover, the representatives of these colonies at Paris were, on account of their familiarity with colonial affairs, looked upon as authorities in all colonial questions, and they took every opportunity to advocate the policy of representative government and political assimilation to which they owed their own importance.

Thus these islands have had an influence upon French history out of all proportion to their size; while in themselves they illustrate all the problems of a modern dynamic society,—the questions of the use of political power, of public education and religion, the distribution of property, and socialism. To these are superadded the intensely interesting problems that always attend the meeting of races on different planes of civilization. The very smallness of the islands makes them specially valuable to the student; like the Athens of Plato and Aristotle, Martinique is a miniature world in which almost all social problems can be studied in a simple form. The student will derive both assistance and pleasure from the insular self-importance and naïveté of the inhabitants.

It will be necessary briefly to review the history of these colonies before 1870, in order that we may understand the bases of the present institutions. Though slavery was abolished in 1848, the whites remained in power politically for some time and also retained the control of labor, which is a question of life and death to industry in tropical colonies. A decree¹ of February 13, 1852, imposed on agricultural laborers the obligation of having a contract

¹ Cited in Huc, *Martinique*, Paris, 1877.

of engagement for one year, or of carrying a *livret*, in default of which they could be punished as vagabonds. Strict penalties were also imposed for missing the daily work. But this measure was too rigid; it defeated its own purpose, in that it caused laborers to strive to become small proprietors and thus to escape from its operation. To supply the necessary labor the system of Hindu immigration was next resorted to. Beginning in 1853 regular importations were made, and by 1870 sixteen thousand Hindu coolies had been introduced into Martinique. A strong fiscal institution, *La Société de Crédit Foncier Colonial*, was created in 1863, for the purpose of assisting the landholders under the new economic conditions.¹ By these means the proprietors of plantations sought to weather the dangers into which the abolition of slavery had brought them.

The political institutions of the French West Indies are the result of two opposite policies,—the Republican policy of absolute centralized assimilation, and the policy of a colonial régime with special laws and privileged local legislatures or general councils, inaugurated by the July monarchy and taken up again under the Second Empire. It was the policy of the three successive Republics to regard the colonies as integral parts of the national territory, to assimilate their administration to that of a French department, and to allow the colonial population a voice in the national parliament. On the contrary, the Monarchy, as well as the Empire, looked upon the colonies as *pays d'exception*, to be governed by special laws and decrees, hence not entitled to participation in the national legislature; they however favored the policy of giving considerable powers, mostly of an administrative nature, to the colonial councils. The products of these two policies constitute the political institutions of the French West Indies since 1870; they have never been harmonized, nor has the one been definitely abandoned for the other; so these colonies enjoy both representation in the national parliament, and the possession of local councils with a great latitude of functions. In reviewing briefly the history of these institutions we shall recognize their somewhat haphazard origin as well as the grave practical difficulties which are due to the lack of subsequent harmonization.

Before the Revolution, the old French colonies, Martinique, Guadeloupe, Guiana, and Réunion were administered, much as are the present English crown colonies, by a governor, with the assistance of an executive council and a colonial assembly summoned at irregular intervals. By royal decree of 1787 the organization of this assembly was regulated and the qualification for suffrage was

¹ *Annuaire de la Martinique*, 1900, p. 208.

fixed as the ownership of at least twelve slaves. With the Revolution came representation in the national assemblies; the creole French were at that time especially popular and influential in French society; so their request for representation was readily accorded. Seventeen *cahiers* supported this demand; that of the *Tiers État* of Versailles even went so far as to propose complete assimilation of the colonies.¹ The idea of colonial representation in parliament is nowhere directly suggested by the French pre-Revolutionary publicists, although it is completely in accord with their general system. It remained for the practical American, Benjamin Franklin, and for Adam Smith, to propose in its concrete form this extreme measure of "Latin assimilation." Its adoption by the French nation at this time was undoubtedly due to the influence and enterprise of the creoles residing in France, who relied on the traditional policy first announced by Louis XIII. in his edict of 1642 "que les descendants des Français habitués ès dites îles seront réputés naturels français, capable de toutes charges et honneurs."

By the constitution of 1795, the colonies were absolutely assimilated to the French national territory² and treated as departments. Before these provisions could produce any practical results they were abrogated by the Consular Constitution of 1799, which deprived the colonies of national representation and placed them again under a régime of special law. Not until the end of the Monarchy of the Restoration, however, was colonial administration definitely organized. By the ordinance of February 9, 1827, there was established in each colony an appointive general council with purely advisory powers. Under the July Monarchy, by the *Charte Coloniale* of April 24, 1833, this council was made elective, with a very high qualification for suffrage (30,000 fr. movable property, or the annual payment of 300 fr. direct taxes). This local assembly sent two delegates to Paris to act as intermediaries between the colony and the ministry. As the colonies had no deputies or senators, the Council retained the services of members of the Chamber and the Senate, who in return for a handsome fee defended the colonial interests within the national parliament.

The Revolutionary government of 1848 returned to the policy of absolute assimilation; it abrogated the system of special laws and discontinued the general councils; as a compensation the colonies received the right of representation in the national parliament, under a system of manhood suffrage in which the newly emancipated negroes were included.

¹ *Archives Parl.*, V. 220.

² Art. 6. "*Les Colonies françaises sont parties intégrantes de la République, et sont soumises à la même loi constitutionnelle.*"

In 1852 the system of special legislation was again restored on the ground that the interests and needs of the colonies differed essentially from those of the mother country, and that the hand of authority and the soothing influence of time were necessary to harmonize the social elements distracted by a radical revolution. It was stated that it was not so much the purpose of the government to discard the colonial element in metropolitan legislation, as to free the situation in the colonies from the agitation of political elections.¹ The right of representation in the national parliament was accordingly annulled.² The Senate, which had been given the power of organic legislation by the constitution of 1852, decreed by the *Sénatus-consulte* of 1854 (May 3) that there should be in the colonies appointive general councils with functions analogous to those of the French departmental assemblies. This measure laid the foundation of the present system of colonial councils. The function of ordinary legislation for the colonies was by the Senate delegated to the executive power, to be exercised by means of administrative decrees, or by orders in council of state. This arrangement is known as the *système des décrets*.

By the very important *Sénatus-consulte* of 1866 (July 4) the powers of the colonial councils were substantially augmented, and they acquired distinctive attributes not possessed by the departmental assemblies. Thus they received the power to legislate on all matters concerning the management of public property, acquisition thereof by the colony, and grants made out of it; on public works and concessions for their execution; on the system of roads; and finally, most important of all, they were given the right to vote all taxes and contributions, to fix the customs tariff and the tariff of the *octroi de mer*.³ The councils remained appointive, one half of their number being named by the governor, the other half by the municipal councils, which were themselves appointed by the head executive. The above attributes of legislation, together with extensive powers of deliberation and advice on matters of the budget and colonial administration, gave the councils great influence. Still they were rather an administrative council than a legislature and had no share in the ordinary civil or criminal legislation, as the French codes were in force in the colonies. The governments immediately following the Revolution of 1870 did not change these functions of the general councils, but, as the principle of election by manhood suffrage was introduced, they soon became almost

¹ *Exposé des Motifs, Procès-verbaux, Sénat, 1852, I. 447 ff.*

² *Décret Organique du 2 février, 1852.*

³ The *pacte colonial*, or system of navigation laws, had been abolished in 1861.

independent of central control. The powers originally granted to an appointive council were left unaltered when that body became an elective assembly. Nor was the national executive deprived of the authority of legislating for the colonies by decree or order in council; this *système des décrets* has become a special grievance of the colonies, since that time.¹ In 1871 colonial representation in the national parliament was re-established, the deputies being elected by universal suffrage.

The system as it has existed since 1870 may therefore be briefly described as follows. The colonies participate in national legislation through the presence of their representatives in the Senate and Chamber of Deputies. General colonial legislation, however, is settled almost entirely by the national executive, and colonial matters come up in the parliament only by way of interpellation or when the budget is being discussed. The local colonial assemblies originate much of the administrative legislation, either by the exercise of their powers enumerated above, or by deliberating upon measures which are given final force of law by *arrêté* of the governor or decree of the head of the state. The civil service in the colonies is recruited chiefly by appointment through the governor; but as he is himself dependent upon the majority in a general council, the latter body exercises great influence in the selection of public officials. It is the operation and the effects of this system in the years from 1870 to 1900 that we desire to investigate in an inquiry which may perhaps throw some light on the character of political life in tropical colonies among a colored population. The value of institutions like colonial representation in the national parliament and elective local assemblies or councils is very much disputed, and but little is known about the exact influence of these institutions upon political activity and party life both in the colonies and in the mother country. Other interesting questions that will claim our attention are the merits and defects of the "system of decrees," the extension of the national constitution to colonial possessions, and the relations of colonial politics to religion, education and socialism. While not neglecting the political experience of Guadeloupe, as well as of French Guiana, we will take Martinique as the typical example of a French tropical colony.

The political history of Martinique since 1870 may be divided into three periods. During the first decade the whites were still practically in control. The end of this period saw the organization of the mulatto government which resulted in the almost complete withdrawal of the whites from politics. While no clearly marked party

¹ It is the subject of Senator Isaac's book, *Constitution et Sénatus-Consultes*.

divisions existed in the second decade, the third and final period brought the growth of two factions among the governing class, who assumed the name and methods of political parties.

No immediate revolution followed upon the establishment of manhood suffrage. The administration in the island remained in the hands of a line of admirals, who, as governors, were bound by the traditions of the former régime. In the executive departments, even as late as 1879 the list of higher officials comprised very few colored men. Thus in the department of justice there were thirty-six whites to six colored men,¹ while in that of the interior the numbers were fourteen to four. In the colonial council the whites only gradually gave way to the increasing number of colored deputies. In 1875 there were still eleven white members out of a total of twenty-four; while in Guadeloupe they retained the majority, and in Réunion they held the whole council.² Thus it was possible to maintain institutions favorable to the great industries, such as the importation of coolie labor; a bounty was even voted to cultivators of coffee. Moreover, although both in 1871 and in 1874 an appropriation of one hundred thousand francs was set aside for the purpose of founding a lay *lycée*, the educational monopoly of the Church remained practically intact. Representatives of the latter expressed themselves in unmincing terms upon the tendency towards purely secular instruction: "L'Église n'acceptera jamais ce programme; elle luttera jusqu'au bout pour défendre ses droits, car, en se rappelant qu'elle seule a été chargée de sauver les âmes, elle se rappellera en même temps qu'à elle seule il a été dit: Allez et enseignez. L'éducation doit être religieuse, elle doit être chrétienne ou elle ne sera pas."³

Expressions like these are the signs of the coming storm. Such signs were not wanting, especially on the part of the whites, who were violent in their opposition to the growing political ambitions of the colored population. In 1877 the governor, Admiral Kergrist, was recalled by the home government which was then in the hands of the "men of the sixteenth of May," because of his liberal tendencies.⁴ His successor, Admiral Grasset, soon came in collision with the general council. He had established a chamber of agriculture composed of the leading landed proprietors of the island.⁵ The council looked upon this as a political movement favoring the white class and refused to vote the credit demanded.

¹ *Annuaire de la Martinique*, 1879.

² Schoelcher, *Polémique Coloniale*, I. 11.

³ *Le Bien Public*, *Bulletin Religieux de la Martinique*, June 24, 1876.

⁴ Schoelcher, *Polémique Coloniale*, Paris, 1882, I. 144.

⁵ Schoelcher, *Polémique Coloniale*, I. 148.

The struggle thus begun came to a head during the administration of Admiral Aube, in the years from 1879 to 1881. The council-general had become restive under the control of the naval governors. It felt its strength as a representative body and had discovered what power it could exercise by means of refusing money grants. By law of the state, ever since the organization of the general councils, the colonial expenses are divided into obligatory and facultative, the latter being fixed by the local assemblies ; as some important services are on the facultative list, the council is enabled to exercise great influence by a suppression of items in the budget. The home government defined its position through a letter¹ written by the Minister of the Marine and Colonies, Admiral Jauréguiberry, to Governor Aube on December 20, 1879. There the minister maintains that the council has no right to vote the suppression of employments or to diminish a credit for the salary of designated persons or for services organized by the ministry of the marine. Positions in these services are to be considered as guaranteed by a regular investiture. The general council refused to take this view of the case. It interpreted the word facultative liberally and held that, if it found a service superfluous or too expensive, it had full power to reduce the credit therefor, regardless of the position of individual incumbents.

In general matters of administration, the council showed itself unfavorable to the policy of internal improvements upheld by the governor. By imposing too strict a time-limit for a survey they defeated a railway project favored by him. They reduced the credits for the following services : roads and bridges, customs, registration, veterinary aid and dry dock. The latter was the subject of particular discussion between the governor and council. On October 26, 1880, the Minister of the Marine wrote to the governor calling his attention to the necessity of liberal credits for keeping up the dock, and deprecating the policy of retrenchment favored by the local assembly.² Notwithstanding this appeal the council voted a reduction of fifteen thousand francs. Another matter of controversy was the protection of the imported Hindu laborers. Under the date of July 14, 1880, the British consul had addressed to the governor a long complaint concerning the inefficiency of the immigration service. He stated that his remonstrances had constantly met the objection that the general council had not voted the necessary funds for the protection of the immigrants and he threatened a withdrawal

¹ Cited in Aube, *La Martinique*, Paris, 1882, p. 99. This book is an account of Aube's administration, with documentary evidences.

² Letter cited in Aube, *La Martinique*, p. 24.

of the treaty of 1862, by which the importation of labor was regulated.¹ Notwithstanding this remonstrance the general council voted the suppression of the special inspection service and re-established a system condemned by experience, under which town syndics performed the inspection and supervision. The council at this time also discontinued the bounty which had before been allowed to cultivators of coffee.

Governor Aube, supported by a unanimous privy council, refused to execute the resolutions of the assembly, which seemed to him contrary to the policy of the government as announced in the letter of December 20, 1879. But when Admiral Cloué in 1880 displaced Admiral Jauréguiberry in the Ministry of the Marine, Governor Aube lost the support of the home government in the course he had followed and was ordered to enforce the decisions taken by the general council.² Thus the powers of this assembly received confirmation from the highest quarters; small wonder that it accepted this action as an admission that it would be impossible to govern the colonies peaceably without its consent, and that it would henceforth have the virtual management of the civil service. At the same time a French civilian, M. Allègre, became governor, and the policy of having admirals in that position was definitely abandoned.³

By a law of July 27, 1880, the criminal jury was introduced into the French Antilles; the law of June 30, 1881, guaranteed the liberty of public meetings; and that of July 29 of the same year, extended the liberty of the press to the colonies. In its political and civil rights the colored population was thus completely assimilated to the mother country and, moreover, the colonial general councils had far greater powers than the provincial assemblies in France. Assimilation was the watchword of the day. On December 7, 1882, the council of Martinique, by a unanimous vote, passed the following resolution: "Considérant que la Martinique, qui est française depuis plus de deux siècles, qui jouit, depuis 1870, des mêmes droits politiques que la métropole, se trouve dans les meilleures conditions possibles pour être assimilée complètement à la mère patrie. . . . Que, pour parvenir à cette assimilation tant désirée, l'assemblée locale abandonnerait sans regret tous les droits et prérogatives qu'elle tient du Sénatus-Consulte du 4 juillet 1866, et qui sont inconnus aux conseils généraux métropolitains; Le Conseil renouvelle, en l'accentuant, le vœu qu'il a émis le 24 novembre

¹ Cited in Aube, *La Martinique*, p. 46.

² Aube, *La Martinique*, p. 56.

³ See *Annuaire de la Martinique*, 1900, p. 54.

1874, et demande que la Martinique soit constituée le plus tôt possible en département français." The general council of Guadeloupe had passed a similar resolution the preceding year.¹

The complete success of the colored majority in the general council in vindicating its political importance aroused bitter feelings of apprehension and anger on the part of the whites. The papers which represented their opinion had always been exceedingly severe in their judgment of the political ambitions of the lower classes. They now began a campaign of unrestricted vilification. How far this was allowed to go will appear from the following extracts. They refer to the former slaves as "ceux qu'une destinée bienveillante designa pour cet exode" from Africa. "Mais, malheureux, sans nous, vos yeux n'auraient jamais vue la lumière, les ossements de vos pères joncheraient les autels de vos dieux, et leurs crânes s'amoncèleraient en pyramides sinistres autour des palais de vos rois. . . . Ce préjugé, dont vous vous plaignez, a sa source dans l'infériorité de votre race, dans la différence indélébile qui existe entre elle et la nôtre, et aussi, faut-il le dire? dans la faible tendance à l'élévation des sentiments qui se manifeste chez ceux d'entre vous qui ont goûté les bienfaits de l'éducation."²

As an organ of the colored politicians, the newspaper *Les Colonies* had been founded in 1878 by M. Hurard, later a deputy in the French Chamber, with the co-operation and under the protection of M. Schoelcher, a French senator, who had been a leader in the emancipation movement of 1848 and who had since that time exerted himself in constant endeavors to vindicate the political rights of the colored population. Having thus acquired an official paper the mulatto régime was becoming fully organized. For over a decade it governed the island without any competition on the part of the whites, who had withdrawn from politics and devoted themselves entirely to industrial pursuits. Certain politicians like M. Hurard or M. Deproge led the "yellow aristocracy" and disposed of the political patronage of the island. The unmixed African population as yet took but little part in political life. In 1881, by instigation of some whites, a committee calling themselves the "Fifty Negroes" organized for the purpose of drawing the negro peasants and laborers into politics. They were, however, severely reprimanded by Senator Schoelcher,³ as introducing racial conflicts, and their agitation remained without result.

¹ Both resolutions are cited in Isaac, *Constitution et Sénatus-Consultes*, pp. 146, 150.

² *La Défense Coloniale*, février, 1882. Cited in Schoelcher, *Polémique Coloniale*, I. II.

³ His address to the committee is given in Schoelcher, *Polémique Coloniale*, II. 64.

During the decade which followed, Martinique suffered much from the sugar crisis of 1884. The millenium which had been expected to result from political freedom, failed to make its appearance. Much of the old charm of creole life in its patriarchal stage had passed away and the colored population found that independence and political rights brought struggles and responsibility as well as power. Pessimism as to the future of the island became general. "C'est un pays perdu," was the prevailing sentiment. Despairing of the situation, many whites withdrew from the island. As the official reports make no distinction between the white, colored, and black population but embrace them all under the term *creoles*, we must go to private accounts for indications of changes in the relative positions of the various populations. Governor Aube in 1882 estimated the white population at eight thousand. By 1888, according to Mr. Lafcadio Hearn,¹ the number had fallen to five thousand and the emigration of the whites was still going on.

The character of political life and action during this period will appear from a survey of the legislation. In December, 1884, the council-general suppressed the importation of contract labor, which had existed since 1853 and which had caused considerable friction between council and governor. The coolie population had reached its highest figure, 14,299, in 1882. By 1889 it fell to 8712, while at present there are only 4,665 Indian laborers left in Martinique.² In 1883 the attempt was made to introduce the policy of division of large estates. Landed estates that had been forfeited to the colony or had been acquired by other means were cut up into hectare holdings and granted out to the poor peasant population.³ The laicization of the common school system, begun in 1881, was continued; by 1890 nine thousand pupils attended the public schools; this number rose to 12,000 within the following ten years. On the other hand public works and internal improvements received but little attention. The far-famed botanical garden at St. Pierre was allowed to relapse into a tropical wilderness. The appropriation for works in connection with the dry dock was reduced to 11,000 francs, while on the other hand 53,000 francs were spent in salaries in the dock administration.⁴ Attempts at railway construction were abandoned, and the telegraph line which connected St. Pierre with Fort-de-France was not extended, nor was there any efficient improvement of the highways in the island.

¹ *Two Years in the French West Indies*, New York, 1890.

² *Annuaire de la Martinique*, 1900, p. 634.

³ *Les Colonies* (the leading journal of Martinique), July 11 and October 6, 1900.

⁴ *Annuaire de la Martinique*, 1900, p. 349.

It was not long before there appeared among the leaders of the mulattoes the signs of coming factional struggles. Two men contended for leadership and management of the political patronage, M. Hurard, the founder of *Les Colonies*, and M. Deproge, both representatives of Martinique in the national parliament. About these two men the factional strife began to centre,—a warfare of much bitterness in which no expedient was left untried. In order to gain more influence both sides appealed to the black electors, who had hitherto taken but little part in political life. M. Deproge, who was an exceedingly shrewd political organizer, succeeded finally in obtaining the control of the political patronage. M. Hurard, on the other hand, to counterbalance this influence preached the policy of reconciliation among all classes of the island, and their co-operation in a unified political life without factional struggles. Thus he not only appealed to the black population, but also favored the participation of the whites in the politics of the island, and caused them to be nominated for public office. The two parties were originally called simply *Hurardist* and *Deprogist*, but as the breach between them became irremediable, they assumed the names of Republican-Progressist and Socialist respectively. Since the middle of the last decade, the whites have entered politics in large numbers, making use of the former party to give expression to their political aims. In the parliamentary election of 1898 the Progressists were successful; one of their candidates, M. Guibert, a resident of France, had been selected as a mark of conciliation between the races.¹ The other, M. Duguesnay, was one of the original leaders of the colored party in 1878. These two men are the deputies of Martinique in the national parliament at the present time. In the senatorial election which followed in 1899, upon the death of Senator Allègre, victory was with the Socialists, who had nominated M. Knight, a wealthy distiller and landowner. By the exigencies of colonial politics, this capitalist is now forced to make common cause in France with Fournière, Millerand, Rochefort, and Guesde. In Martinique the two parties are at present in a state of balance, the Socialists having a majority of one in the general council.

We must not, however, attribute to these parties a close adhesion to the principles advocated by the parties bearing the same names in France. Thus the Socialists, whose leaders are taken from among the property-holding colored bourgeoisie, pursue none of the measures favored by true Socialists. They leave the building of roads in private hands and refuse to pass a progressive income-tax, or vote subventions for old-age insurance; moreover they show no

¹ *Les Colonies*, April 11, 1900.

hostility to the Church but rather seek its favor. Their chief exertion seems to be to work on the dissatisfaction of the agricultural population by making vague promises of better wages, as well as by insinuating that the whites are trying to recover authority to gain the suffrage of the masses.¹ The Republican-Progressists on the other hand engage in so-called patronal socialism. They encourage the establishment of old-age pensions by the employers with subvention by the state. In their election manifestoes they state "We are representatives of the school of Brisson and Bourgeois, who have assisted in the triumph of the Republicans without leading the people to violence. We favor a policy of tolerance. The industrial proprietors ask for quiet and peace not sectary politics."²

The strife between the two factions is full of bitterness and animosity. Election frauds,³ political duels, and even assassinations are the constant accompaniment of electoral battles. The masses, the agricultural population, are appealed to by both sides, which puts them in a state of unrest and excitement. Political agitation of this kind led to a veritable drama in the year 1900. During the two preceding elections, both parties had made lavish promises of increased wages and "better times" to the proletariat. As the hopes thus raised were disappointed, there occurred in February, 1900, a large strike among the laborers on the sugar estates, resulting in the destruction of property. Military aid was summoned and a bloody encounter took place at the village of François, in which twelve laborers were killed and many seriously wounded. Although order was thus restored the lamentable event left behind it the most bitter feelings among the various classes of the island. It also led to an interpellation in parliament, which illustrates the manner of dealing with colonial questions in the home legislature. In the Chamber of Deputies the two Progressists of Martinique tried to fix the responsibility for the event upon the Socialists and upon the governor, who is a protégé of the Socialist leaders. Their principal effort seemed to be to use this occurrence for the purpose of getting the official patronage of the island into their hands. The Waldeck-Rousseau government had so far classed these deputies with the Nationalists and had not allowed them any influence over the patron-

¹ *Les Colonies*, March 17, 1900.

² *Les Colonies*, Oct. 6, 1900. The following election manifesto of a M. Paul Gaillardin is amusing in its *naïveté*. "Je suis un républicain convaincu, j'aime la République, ses lois sociales, ses institutions libérales et démocratiques, surtout lorsque ces lois et institutions sont appliquées par de représentants justes et comme moi, aimant la liberté."

³ *Les Colonies*, Aug. 11 and Sept. 25, 1900.

age, which was retained by the Socialist senator. While the deputies thus made a purely political and administrative question of the strike, the French Socialist deputies treated it as an economic strike due to the insufficient payment of the laborers and to the unfulfilled ante-election promises of the proprietors. The debate, however, left the field of colonial politics, when M. Ribot bitterly assailed the ministry for its alliance with the Socialists. Thereupon the latter, although inclined to censure the government for the use of troops against striking laborers, joined in the vote of confidence for the reason, as given by M. Carnaud, that they "did not wish to furnish an occasion to some ambitious men for gathering up a port-folio from the blood of the laborers of Martinique." The vote passed by a majority of forty-one.¹

The financial situation of the colonies is at present far from prosperous. Although there is no large public debt, the financial resources will be strained to the uttermost by the withdrawal of the subvention so far allowed by the French government. By the law of April 13, 1900, which went into effect on January 1, 1901, the colonies which have general councils are held responsible for all civil and police expenditures incurred by them. The only expenditures that will be met by the mother country are those for the military and naval defense. In this manner the amount to be met by the budget of Martinique will be increased from 5,729,000 francs in 1900 to about 8,000,000 francs.² As a return for this added financial burden, the colonies have asked for an increased autonomy of their general councils.³ By the tariff law of January 11, 1892, the powers of these councils had been cut down, inasmuch as the colonies were made subject to the French tariff and could no longer have a special customs system as under the *Sénatus-Consulte* of 1866. But at present there seems to be little disposition on the part of the French government to add to the colonial autonomy. In his speech during the interpellation of March 26 the Minister of Colonies, M. Decrais, said: "I believe that the authority of the government must be fortified, that it must be freed from all local influences." He added: "Il faut le dire, les passions politiques et électorales sont si vives sous ce climat ardent et dans cette île resserrée, elles y ont créée une telle atmosphère des haines personnelles

¹ The whole interpellation is reported in *Les Colonies*. It took place on March 26, 1900.

² *Les Colonies*, August 6, 1900.

³ See the proposal of M. Ursleur, deputy of Guiana, cited in *Annales des Sciences Politiques*, March, 1900, p. 233. He says: "Nous demandons à payer l'impôt du sang, nous demandons à rester citoyens français, mais nous désirons gérer nous-mêmes nos finances."

et locales, que la Chambre et le Gouvernement doivent y porter toute leur attention."

M. Picanon, the colonial inspector who visited the Antilles in 1900, expressed his dissatisfaction with the excessive functionarism in the islands. It was his opinion that the functionaries must be separated from politics and that the disastrous interference of politics with industry must cease. Political interference is especially dangerous in a small country with monoculture. His concrete recommendations are that there be instituted an irremovable magistrature of metropolitan origin and that the gendarmerie be put under the control of the governor instead of the *maires*.¹ There is therefore little likelihood that the demands of the colonies for further autonomy will find a favorable hearing with the government.

By the law of July 7, 1900, the French colonial army was organized. Even as far back as 1848, by the decree of May 3, the French laws of recruitment were made applicable to the colonies. The decree was never put into execution, but the organic law of the national army of July 15, 1889, again imposed the duty of military service upon the colonists. It was not however until 1900 that provisions for the actual organization of this part of the army were made. The colonial papers had always professed the eagerness of the colonists to pay the "impost of blood," and the final execution of the law was met with apparent enthusiasm, which is explained by the fact that service under the French colors is looked upon as imparting a new dignity to the negroes of the colonies.

It would be interesting to dwell on the mental characteristics and the general culture of the population of the islands, but we can here only indicate some facts that have a direct bearing on political life. While the leaders of the colored class are enthusiastic for education, and while large amounts of the public money are annually spent for that purpose,² still the ignorance of the masses is matter of constant comment on the part of the colonial papers. Among a population of 187,692 there were, in 1894, eighty thousand persons above the age of fourteen who were unable to read and write, leaving only 47,600 who had those accomplishments.³ The moral status of the population according to European standards is very low. Out of the number given above only 20,312 are married—that is, there are only about 10,000 households in Martinique, and three-fourths of the children are born out of wedlock. While the ceremonial of the Church still retains its

¹ *Les Colonies*, June 6, 1900.

² In the budget for 1900, 1,027,095 francs are appropriated for education, as over against 787,520 francs for public works. *Annuaire de la Martinique*, 1900, p. 296.

³ *Annuaire de la Martinique*, 1900, p. 630.

hold on the masses of the population, they are more deeply influenced by the arts of the native sorcerers (*quimboiseurs*). The Church has never been in sympathy with the political ambitions of the mulattoes, and it bewails the bitter struggles which party politics have introduced. When asked to celebrate a mass to commemorate the twenty-five years of political service of Député Duquesnay, Abbé Parel of Fort-de-France expresses himself as follows: "Political ambition does wrong to the people; it works their ruin. We have just had an electoral battle which has furnished too many recruits to hospitals and prisons. What we need is unity of the country under the guidance of the Church. Party strife is unchristian."¹ The leaders of the mulatto party have exerted themselves to acquire the intellectual culture and the liberal principles of France. No more faithful exponent of the tenets of the older Liberalism could be imagined than the paper *Les Colonies*. Frequently, of course, this adoption of ideas is far from being an effective assimilation, and is only a very superficial acquisition producing ridiculous incongruities. Thus when M. Hurard spoke before a local labor union, the worthy negro who replied to him gave utterance to Orphic maxims such as "Heureux celui qui a pu créer des ingrats," and "L'exile est la récompense des grands hommes" (referring to M. Hurard's exile from office). The strikers at François addressed the gendarmes in Mirabeau's famous phrase, "We are here by the will of the people and we shall yield only to bayonets." A speaker at a public function thus apostrophized the mother country, "O France, berceau de la liberté, terre chérie, où poussent les plus beaux sentiments."² On the other hand when papers like *Les Colonies* discuss public questions they bring to bear a clearness of style and a moderation of judgment that do not allow one to suspect the bitter virulence of political strife in the Antilles. They are full of enthusiasm for popular education, for equality of rights, for a civilization of peace and industry, for a separation of church and state with complete religious toleration. Often there is a severe self-criticism entirely different from the ordinary wailing of tropical colonists to which the world has become callous from long hearing, far removed too from the supposed self-importance and vanity of a colored population. They recognize and lament the many evils of their political life, but plead for time in order that they may learn the lesson of self-government and improve their institutions by experience. A population that is thus struggling away from its inherited tendencies, tendencies that are threatening to engulf Hayti

¹ *Les Colonies*, May 29, 1900.

² *Les Colonies*, July 30, 1900.

in the darkness of savagery, certainly deserves credit and sympathy. It must, however, be remembered that it is only a small part of the population that is animated by these ideals. The masses lead a shiftless life of indolence and ignorance, much given to petty thieving, drink, and gambling,¹ and influenced by dark superstitions of African origin. Through the efforts of the political leaders these masses have recently come to take a greater share in political life. In 1894, out of 43,000 registered voters only 9,500 exercised their right of suffrage, while in the year 1900, 23,492 votes were cast by a total of 45,650 registered electors.² In districts where a candidacy is uncontested, the vote is naturally very light.

As we have seen, it has been attempted to stir up social discontent among the masses, in order to gain the suffrage of the black electors. The socialist agitation in the islands has taken a purely aggressive form, exhausting itself in negative criticism and doing little to promote social legislation. The target of popular discontent is the sole industry in the islands—the sugar culture. Far from prosperous on account of the competition of producers in other lands, the industry is constantly threatened by hostile legislation emanating from the colonial democracy. There are two methods of attack: by an enforced increase in wages, and by augmenting the export duty on sugar. In Martinique, laborers until recently were paid eight francs for six half-days' labor, that is a franc per half-day with a supplement of twenty-five per cent. provided they continued to work for six half-days. The laborers usually divide their day between work in the canefields of the sugar companies and the cultivation of their own small farms or gardens. By obligatory arbitration the wages were in 1900 forced up to fr. 1.25 and fr. 1.50 per half day.³ As Hindu immigration has ceased since 1884 the employers are entirely dependent on native laborers. The export duty on sugar was recently raised from one franc to fr. 2.50 per one hundred kilograms in Guadeloupe, and from one franc to fr. 1.70 in Guiana.⁴ The sugar culture with its vast estates and its memories of slavery finds little favor in the eyes of the blacks; they prefer the parcellation of the tracts now owned by the industrials and the introduction of what has been called "a banana-patch civilization." M. Hurard expresses the inclination of the insular population to socialism in characteristic language; he says, "We creoles follow France because we have absorbed the

¹ *Les Colonies*, October 5 and 12, 1900.

² Election reports in *Les Colonies*, May, 1900.

³ Account of the interpellation of March 26, 1900, in *Les Colonies*.

⁴ *Annales des Sciences Politiques*, March, 1900, p. 261.

French conception, because we are of past servitude and hence by atavism predisposed to integral enslavement in collectivism, because we poor islanders can have no ambitions beyond being functionaries." The present governor has gone so far as to declare that in Martinique the régime of large properties is incompatible with the actual social state. In order to maintain and protect it, he considers it indispensable that the laws which govern British dependencies be applied to the colonies.¹ The French Socialists look upon their colonial associates as an important accession to their force and are ever ready to defend the colored democracy. "For us Socialists the negro workmen of Martinique are brothers in humanity, having the same rights and aspirations. They have their place in our hearts."² They count upon the colonial deputies in their fights against the reactionary tendencies and the colonists in turn are always pointing to their services in the establishment and maintenance of republican institutions in the mother country, as a basis of their claim to have the principle of colonial representation preserved and extended.

From the experience of the French Antilles we can draw some general conclusions as to the working of the system of representation there in use. Considering first representation in the national parliament, we find that it has given the deputies themselves great personal influence. Since the ministries are usually in need of every vote that can be obtained and since the colonial deputies are more independent in national affairs than are those who have French constituencies, their support is always courted. The very adoption of the republican form of government in 1875 was made possible by the votes of the colonial deputies; the Wallon amendment, by which the title of president was bestowed upon MacMahon, was passed by a majority of only one vote. In 1882, just when the affairs of the French nation were in a serious crisis, M. Blancsubé, the deputy for Cochinchina, was the leader in bringing about the overthrow of the Freycinet government. The colonial deputies and senators are by virtue of their office members of the *Conseil Supérieur des Colonies*, the assembly upon whose advice the colonial ministry bases its action. They also take a leading part in all congresses where colonial questions are discussed. The important International Congress of 1889 and the French national congress of 1890 were practically led in all their resolutions by Senator Isaac of Guadeloupe. He there favored not only the complete assimilation of the older colonies to the metropolitan institutions and the

¹ Cited in the course of the interpellation of March 26, 1900, *Les Colonies*.

² M. Alexandre Zévaès in the interpellation of March 26, 1900, *Les Colonies*.

abolishment of the "régime of decrees," but he also carried a resolution favoring a like policy for all colonial dependencies of France.¹ To the influence of the colonial deputies more than to any other cause may be attributed the persistence of the assimilation policy in French colonization. By the very act of vindicating their privileges of representation they favor the extension of these principles to the newer colonies; and as they are not only specially interested, but are also considered specially competent in colonial affairs, their influence has been preponderant. They were not able, however, to prevent the ultimate establishment of a separate ministry of colonies, which they had long resisted. Since 1882 there had been attempts to organize the colonial service apart from the Ministry of Marine. It was attached alternately to the latter and to the Ministry of Commerce. Under the policy of assimilation carried to its logical conclusion a separate ministry of colonies is unnecessary, as each of the ministries in France manages its respective share of affairs in the colonies; such is the arrangement with respect to Algiers, and this was what the colonial deputies had hoped to attain in their own case. The importance of the newer colonies and the growth of interest in colonial expansion led, however, to the establishment of a separate ministry by the law of March 20, 1894. As this ministry is naturally more interested in the newly acquired vast domains of France in Africa and in Asia than in the older colonies, the influence of the colonial representatives has been diminished in consequence of its creation.

No direct beneficial influence of the system of parliamentary representation on the colonies themselves can be traced, except in the matter of obtaining occasional favors of a fiscal nature, such as subventions and exemptions.² No thorough-going reforms in colonial affairs have been suggested or carried out by the colonial representatives. This is partly due, of course, to the fact that parliament does not as a general rule interfere with colonial affairs, but leaves their management to the executive. The representatives are accordingly inclined to view the affairs of their constituencies from a narrow partisan point of view. We have already alluded to the manner in which the senators and deputies of Martinique made of the strike a mere question for the control of patronage. A deputy of Guade-

¹ Procès-Verbaux du Congrès colonial National. Cited in Alcindor, *Les Antilles Françaises*, Paris, 1899, p. 104. "La nation est obligée en conscience de faire participer ses nouveaux sujets, dans la mesure du possible, aux avantages que lui assure à elle même la supériorité de sa culture et de son état social." Procès-Verbaux du Congrès International de 1889. Cited in De Saussure, *Psychologie de la Colonisation Française*, p. 256.

² Thus, e. g., Senator Cicero of Guadeloupe obtained a reduction of the charges imposed upon his colony in 1900. *Les Colonies*, April 11, 1900.

loupe has described the situation as follows : " The greatest part of their activity is given, no matter what repugnance they may feel thereto, to the task of cultivating the good will of the minister towards their friends among the colonial functionaries. They must constantly be on their guard against adverse influence and spend their time soliciting support in the bureaux. The colonial elections have become a matter of mere personal antagonism."¹

As we turn from representation in the national parliament to the local colonial council we find that it is animated by the same political desires as the deputies and senators in Paris, and that its chief concern is the control of the patronage. The uppermost consideration in the mind of a councillor is always the gaining of votes through local influence, or the punishment or reward of the administrative departments according to the attitude they have taken toward his election.² The fiscal policy of the councils is governed by the same considerations. Expenses for public improvements of an industrial nature, such as harbors and roads, are constantly kept down. On the other hand since the influence of the general council grows with the number of officials dependent on it, the expenditure for salaries is constantly increasing. Thus, Martinique has 1400 functionaries out of 14,000 men who could possibly hold civil service positions.³ The bane of functionarism is fixed upon the colonies, and political life has consequently become an acrid struggle for personal influence and patronage. By the side of this expenditure for the civil service, large sums are voted for public education and scholarships ; the latter fulfill the double purpose of advancing learning and providing for the protégés of the politicians. Large grants and concessions are often made out of the public property ; thus, the council of Guiana granted 200,000 hectares of valuable land to one individual, and at the same time proposed to divide the colonial reserve fund among the communes.⁴

It may be interesting to glance for a moment at the parallel experience of Great Britain with the island of Jamaica. Although the English have tried representative institutions in the tropical colonies, they have never adopted manhood suffrage. The measures by which, under Lord Derby's administration of the Colonial Office in

¹ Letter in *L'Indépendant de la Guadeloupe*, February 16, 1899. Merivale in his lectures on colonization (1841) expresses the belief that colonial representatives would be mere party agents in Parliament.

² Debate in the General Council of Guiana, cited in *Annales des Sciences Politiques*, XV. 256.

³ *Les Colonies*, Sept. 15, 1900. Also Mr. Austin Lee's *Report on French Colonies*, published by the British Foreign Office, 1900.

⁴ *Annales des Sciences Politiques*, XV. 259.

1884, representative institutions were introduced into Jamaica and Mauritius restricted the electorate by a high property qualification ; so that for instance in Mauritius out of a population of 400,000 inhabitants there are only 3,000 voters. In Jamaica, Lord Derby accorded to the elective members of the colonial council the control over the finances of the island. We cannot here trace the history of the last fifteen years, but the most recent developments are so interesting that they deserve notice in connection with the experience in the French Antilles. On account of financial difficulties into which the colony had fallen, a royal commission was appointed to investigate the situation and make suggestions. The outcome was the report by Sir David Barbour¹ in which he criticizes the Jamaican financial management and especially the habit of borrowing for the construction of public works not directly productive. He also records "a serious defect in system in so far as regards the relations between the Colonial Office, the governor of the colony, and the elected members" which he considers "inseparable from any attempt to combine in a working compromise the conflicting systems of crown government and representative government." He believes that the constitution of Jamaica has aggravated the present financial difficulties, that it leads to much friction and loss of time without a satisfactory result. The colonial legislature is also criticized for refusing to vote the salary of a necessary official and because the unofficial members pressed for an increase in the educational credit. In his letter of instruction² to the governor, Mr. Chamberlain takes up these objections and enforces them from his own experience, as when he says that he favors retrenchment in the expenditure for education, which has not, he thinks, produced results commensurate with the outlay. He then instructs the governor to appoint the full number of official members and to retain them so as to place the elected members in a permanent minority in the council. He bases his action on the principle that "where financial assistance is given a colony by the imperial government, the latter must have control over the finances." Of course, the Jamaicans most vehemently protest against this suppression of the powers of their representatives. The mayor and council of Kingston in a petition to the Queen, submitted that "to reduce the educational vote will work a vast amount of harm for which no prosperity in other directions can compensate."³ But as financial and industrial relations are uppermost in the mind of the Secretary for the Colonies, it is very un-

¹ *Parliamentary Blue Books*, C.—9412, July, 1899.

² Aug. 22, 1899, *Parliamentary Blue Books*, Cd. 125, April, 1900, p. 6.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

likely that he will modify his decision. He has thereby clearly entered upon the policy of doing away with representative institutions in the tropics. And in general, English statesmen have at present little but criticism for the policy of Lord Derby, whose Liberalism they consider decidedly unpractical.

In France too there are many indications of a changed attitude of the public mind on questions of colonial politics. Formerly the ideal of assimilation was proclaimed as the national policy almost without a dissenting voice. In the *exposé des motifs du Sénatus-consulte de 1854*, we find this statement: "L'assimilation progressive des colonies à la mère-patrie est dans la nature des choses, dans le vœu légitime des populations, et peut-être aussi dans les devoirs du gouvernement métropolitain." The commission of forty-five members nominated by the National Assembly at Bordeaux in 1871 voted: "Prenons pour devise: Assimilation politique des colonies à la mère-patrie."¹ During the two decades that followed, all the important organic laws of France were applied also to the colonies. The colonial commission appointed by Admiral Pothuau in 1878, and that named by Minister Duclerc in 1882, both pronounced in favor of assimilation, as did also the Colonial Congresses of 1889 and 1890. But within the last decade a new tendency has made itself felt. Already in 1888, Minister Dislère's scheme for further assimilation of the old colonies by erecting them into departments was defeated in the parliament. The troubles in the Antilles as well as the disappointment which the French attempts at legal assimilation suffered in Annam have led many politicians to question the wisdom of the traditional policy. Moreover the experience of the French with Tunis, where they have used the system of a protectorate without assimilation, has been so much more satisfactory than in Algiers or Indo-China, that the lesson has impressed itself strongly upon the minds of statesmen and publicists. In 1898 M. D'Estournelles de Constant introduced a bill for the suppression of the parliamentary representation of Senegal, French India, and Cochin-China. He believes that the system is so firmly fixed in the Antilles that, for sentimental reasons, it may there be allowed to continue, but he strenuously opposes the extension of the principle to the other colonies.² M. Doumer, Governor-general of Indo-China, in his report to the Minister of Colonies in 1900, discourages the idea of legislative and social assimilation.³ M. P. Leroy-Beaulieu, too, believes in administrative and financial decentralization

¹ March 28, 1870. Cited in Schoelcher, *Polémique Coloniale*, I. 16.

² D'Estournelles de Constant, *Contre la Représentation Coloniale*, in *La Revue de Paris*, January 1, 1899.

³ Cited in *U. S. Consular Reports*, Dec., 1900, p. 496.

and considers self-government and universal suffrage in the colonies as an absurd institution.¹

Here for the present the matter rests. It is clear that the function of the French Antilles as models for colonial legislation is past and that, while their institutions will perhaps not be disturbed, the French colonial administration will be guided more by English experience and by the evident demands of the great colonies recently acquired by the French Republic. For these tropical colonies, it is believed that experienced administration is the main consideration, and that a settled society should not be disturbed and distracted by the introduction of European institutions and the unrest of party politics. Instead of favoring general assimilation, French statesmen are beginning to show a more practical spirit in the endeavor to take account of the peculiar needs of populations in the most varied stages of development.

PAUL S. REINSCH.

¹ *L'Économiste Français*, Jan. 27, 1900.

DOCUMENTS

1. *The Society of Dissenters founded at New York in 1769.*

HISTORIANS have long recognized more or less fully the importance of the controversies which, about the middle of the eighteenth century, prevailed between Anglicans and Dissenters in the colonies over the question of a colonial episcopate and other related subjects. The special conditions attending these discussions in New York have also been explained. It has been noticed that the discussion over the founding of King's College constituted one phase of the subject. The fact that, when the Revolution began, the Presbyterians of New York City had long but vainly been seeking a charter of incorporation for themselves as a religious society, has also been brought out. They denied the validity of the interpretation put by the officials on the act of 1693, to the effect that it established the Church of England in the four southern counties of the province. They also denied that the English Church was *de jure* established in all the colonies, and therefore that Dissenters were subject to all the regulations prescribed in the Act of Toleration. Presbyterians also sought to obtain for themselves the position of advantage secured for the sect in Scotland by the Act of Union. In April, 1769, and repeatedly thereafter, efforts were made to pass acts relieving Dissenters from the payment of taxes for the support of the clergy of a church to which they did not belong. But these efforts all failed because of the opposition of the Council; it would make no concession to the demand.

That, along with the Presbyterian clergymen of the city, William Livingston, John Morin Scott and Alexander McDougall were prominently connected with the movement, is also well known. The activity of Livingston as a pamphleteer and contributor to the newspapers in the Presbyterian interest, has been clearly described by his biographer and others. But hitherto writers have failed to understand how definite was the form taken by the Presbyterian movement, and what wide-reaching plans these bodies cherished for securing united action on the part of Dissenters generally throughout the colonies against British and Anglican claims. Had these plans been carried into execution, a religious character would have been given to the Revolution.

The document which is here printed shows the ultimate point reached by the Presbyterians as agitators and the plan of operations which they had formulated early in 1769. It was recently discovered among a mass of judicial records which are stored in the vaults of the Court House of New York County. It consists of minutes of various meetings held during the months of February and March, 1769, by leading members of the Presbyterian and Baptist churches of New York City, in which they organized themselves as a "Society of Dissenters." Their object was to protest and to enlarge their rights. It was intended that this society should be the parent of a federation of similar societies, and that these, like the political communities of the time, should be bound together by committees of correspondence. But beyond the issue of the circular letter printed here, the movement scarcely went. The minutes abruptly close with the entry for March 21, 1769. They occupy the early pages of a volume of ordinary ledger size, which in 1791 was filled with entries of writs by one of the clerks of the Supreme Court of the state.

A part of these minutes, viz., the Articles of Agreement and the Circular Letter, were printed in Gaine's *New York Gazette*, July 24, 1769. This was done by one of the Anglican opponents of the Dissenters. In the next number, that of July 31, appeared an unsigned letter (from a Presbyterian) avowing the Circular Letter and the Articles which had been printed, and declaring the intention to continue meetings and keep up the agitation against the establishment of bishops. A few other references to the matter appear in contemporary newspapers, but nothing of special consequence, save a circular letter published by Gaine, September 25, 1769, which was prepared in March, 1764, by certain Presbyterians of Pennsylvania for the purpose of bringing about closer union. These articles, however, make no express reference to Anglicans. Since Gaine's *Gazette* is so rare, and we apparently now have a correct copy of the minutes of all, or nearly all, the meetings that were held, it has been deemed advisable to print the minutes in full.

HERBERT L. OSGOOD.

NEW YORK, February 17th 1769.

Whereas it is of the utmost Importance for the different Christian Denominations in the Country, not belonging to the Church, professing themselves to be in Communion with the Church of England, to unite together for the preservation of their common and respective civil and religious Rights and Privileges, against all Oppressions and Encroachments by those of any Denomination whatsoever; it is thought proper for

that purpose, to form a Society for taking Care of the said common and respective, Civil and Religious Rights and Privileges, of those of their Brethren in the Colony of New York, and the Neighboring Colonies, who do not profess to belong to the said Church, professing themselves to be in Communion with the Church of England: And for that purpose the following Persons voluntarily met together to wit.

Messrs. PETER VAN BRUGH LIVING-

STON

HENRY WILLIAMS

SAMUEL BROOME

THOMAS SMITH

ALEXANDER M^cDOUGALL

SAMUEL LOUDON

WILLIAM GOFORTH

JOSEPH HALLETT

JOHN MORIN SCOTT

WILLIAM LIVINGSTON

WILLIAM M^cKINLEY

ROBERT BOYD

FRANCIS VAN DYCKE

SAMUEL EDMONDS

JONATHAN BLAKE

WILLIAM NEILSON

JOHN BROOME and

JOHN M^cKESSON

The above named Gentlemen being so met together for the purpose aforesaid did unanimously elect Mr. Peter Van Brugh Livingston their Moderator for the present Meeting. And thereupon it was unanimously agreed,

1st That the Society do appoint a Secretary to make Entries of their Transactions who shall remain their Secretary for one year at least and that John M^cKesson be the Secretary of Society for the present year.

2^{dly} That fifteen members of the said Society shall form a Quorum to proceed on Business at any Meeting.

3^{dly} That for the present the said Society is not to exceed the Number of Sixty Persons in the whole.

4^{thly} That for the present this Society will receive as Members thereof from the Presbyterian Church in the City under the pastoral Charge of the Reverend Mr. Mason any number not exceeding five: From the Baptist Church in this City under the pastoral Charge Reverend Mr. any number not exceeding seven; and from the Presbyterian Church in this City under the pastoral Charge of the Reverend Messrs. Rodgers and Treat any Number not exceeding sixteen.

5^{thly} That it shall be in the power of a Majority of the Members now present belonging to the two presbyterian Churches and the Baptist Church to nominate such other persons belonging to their particular Churches to fill up their respective Numbers in the said Society as they shall think proper.

6^{thly} That this Society shall meet on the ——— Evening in every Week until they shall agree to meet seldomer: And that on every special Emergency the Secretary with the Leave of the Moderator shall be authorized to summon a special Meeting of the said Society at other times to be notified to one Member of this Society belonging to each Congregation.

7^{thly} That no Matters of Doctrine, Church Discipline, or Worship shall ever be the subject either of the Acts or Conversation of the said Society.

8^{thly} That the Society shall as their last Act at every Meeting chuse a Moderator for the next ensuing Meeting ; and that the Moderator for the Time being, immediately before such Election, shall fix the Hour and place for such Meeting.

9^{thly} That there shall be a standing Committee for Correspondence appointed who shall have it in Charge, to write to such proper persons not belonging to the Church professing themselves to be in Communion of the Church of England in the several Counties in this Colony, and the neighboring Colonies, as are of sufficient Influence for that purpose, to constitute as many Societies as may be thought proper to correspond with this Society, respecting such Matters as properly fall within the Design for which this Society is constituted. And that the said Committee of Correspondence, do from Time to Time lay before the Society such Letters as they shall write before they shall be sent, and also the Letters which they shall from Time to Time receive, which shall from Time to Time be filed [by] the Secretary of the Society.

10^{thly} That in every different part of the Country, whether in this or the Neighboring Colonies, where a like Society shall be established such Society shall be entitled to send a Delegate to the Meetings of this Society, who shall have an equal Voice with any other Member of this Society.

11^{thly} That at every Meeting of this Society the Proceedings of their last Meeting shall be read by their Secretary, immediately after the Moderator has taken the Chair ; and before the Society proceeds to any Business.

12^{thly} That for the Preservation of good Order, when any Member speaks on any Matter in this Society, he shall always address himself to the Moderator in the Chair. That no more than one Member shall speak at a Time ; and that no Member speak more than once to the same point on any particular Matter or Subject in debate.

13^{thly} That no Member shall speak on any Subject not properly within the Design of this Institution, whilst the Moderator is in the Chair.

14^{thly} That no Member shall depart from the said Society whilst the Moderator is in the Chair without his Leave.

It is ordered by the Moderator that this Society do meet at the House of David Phillipse in ——— Street in the North ward of this City at six of the Clock.

And lastly William Livingston Esq. is elected Moderator of this Society for the next ensuing Meeting.

At a Meeting of this Society according to Appointment of the Moderator at the House of David Phillipse on Tuesday the Twenty-first day of February 1769.

Present WILLIAM LIVINGSTON ESQUIRE Moderator.

MESSRS. HENRY WILLIAMS	ROBERT BOYD
SAMUEL BROOME	FRANCIS VAN DYCK
PETER VAN BRUGH LIVINGSTON	WILLIAM M ^c KINLEY
ALEXANDER M ^c DOUGALL	WILLIAM GOFORTH
SAMUEL LOUDEN	SAMUEL EDMONDS
JOHN MORIN SCOTT	JOHN BROOME and
WILLIAM NEILSON	JOHN MCKESSON

According to the Eleventh general Rule of the Society the proceedings of the last Meeting were read.

A Majority of the Members of this Society who belong to the Presbyterian Church under the pastoral Charge of the Reverend Messrs. Rodgers and Treat being present to wit Mr. Moderator, Messrs. Peter Van Brugh Livingston, John Broome, John Morin Scott Alexander McDougall William Neilson Samuel Broome and John McKesson do nominate Messrs. David Van Horne and Peter R. Livingston two Gentlemen belonging to their particular Church and present them to this Society to be Members thereof and they are unanimously received accordingly.

All the Members of this Society who belong to the Baptist Church under the pastoral charge of the Revd. Mr. — being present to wit Messrs. Henry Williams, Samuel Edmonds Francis Van Dyck and William Goforth do nominate Messrs. John Stites, Isaac Skillman and William Lawson three Gentlemen belonging to their particular Church and present them to this Society to be members thereof and they are unanimously received accordingly; which Gentlemen compleat the Number of Members allotted to that Church by the fourth general Rule of this Society.

A Majority of the Members of this Society who belong to the Presbyterian Church under the pastoral Charge of the Reverend Mr. Mason being present, to wit Messrs. Samuel Loudon Robert Boyd and William M^cKinley do nominate Mr. Alexander Robertson a Gentleman belonging to their particular Church and present him to this Society to be a Member thereof and he is unanimously received accordingly which Gentleman completes the Number of Members allotted to that Church by the fourth general Rule of this Society.

The Society Agree that nine of their Members be appointed a Committee for Correspondence to bring in a Draft or Drafts of Letter or Letters to be laid before this Society, as soon as the said Committee shall have such Draft or Drafts as they shall think proper prepared for that purpose; And that any Gentleman who is Moderator for the Time being by reason of the short duration of his Office may be appointed a Member of any Standing Committee; And that the said Committee for Correspondence shall be Elected by Ballot and shall be and remain a Standing Committee for one year.

The Society then proceeded to elect by Ballot nine of their Members to be a Standing Committee for Correspondencies whereupon the follow-

ing Gentlemen were duly elected to form the said Committee viz. Messrs. Peter Van Brugh Livingston Henry Williams, John Morin Scott, William Livingston, David Van Horne, Peter R. Livingston, Alexander McDougall, John Broome and Samuel Loudon.

Mr. Moderator appoints next Tuesday Evening at six of the Clock at this House of David Phillips to be the Time and place for the next Meeting of this Society.

And Lastly, Mr. Henry Williams is elected Moderator for the next ensuing Meeting of this Society.

At a Meeting of the Society pursuant to _____ of the Moderator at the House of David Phillips on Tuesday Evening the Twenty Eighth of February 1769.

Present Mr. HENRY WILLIAMS Moderator.

Messrs. THOMAS SMITH	ALEXANDER M ^c DOUGALL
DAVID VAN HORNE	ALEXANDER ROBERTSON
PETER V. B. LIVINGSTON	SAMUEL EDMONDS
SAMUEL LOUDON	JOHN STITES
W ^m GOFORTH	ISAAC SKILLMAN
SAMUEL BROOME	WILLIAM M ^c KINLEY
WILLIAM LIVINGSTON	JONATHAN BLAKE
FRANCIS VAN DYCKE	ROBERT BOYD and
PETER R. LIVINGSTON	JOHN MCKESSON

Pursuant to the Eleventh general Rule of the Society the Minutes of the last Preceding Meeting were read.

A Majority of the Members of this Society who belong to the Presbyterian Chh. under the pastoral Charge of the Reverend Messrs. Rodgers and Treat being present to wit Messrs. David Van Horne Peter Van Brugh Livingston Thomas Smith Samuel Broome William Livingston Peter R. Livingston Alexander McDougall and John McKesson do nominate Doctor Benjamin Y Prime a Gentleman belonging to their particular Church and present him to this Society to be a member thereof and he is unanimously received accordingly.

Mr. Moderator appoints next Monday Evening for the next meeting of this Society at this House of Mr. Phillips at six of the Clock in the Evening.

And lastly Mr. David Van Horne is elected Moderator for the next Meeting of this Society.

At a Meeting of the Society according to the Adjournment of the Moderator at the House of David Phillips on Monday the Sixth of March 1769.

Present Mr. DAVID VAN HORNE Moderator.

Messrs. HENRY WILLIAMS	WILLIAM LIVINGSTON
ALEXR. M ^c DOUGALL	PETER R. LIVINGSTON
WILLIAM NEILSON	ISAAC SKILLMAN
JOSEPH HOLLETT	WILLIAM GOFORTH

SAMUEL BROOME
PETER V. B. LIVINGSTON

FRANCIS VAN DYCKE
ALEXANDER ROBERTSON

BENJ. Y. PRIME
WILLIAM MCKINLEY
SAMUEL LOUDEN
JOHN M^cKESSON
ROBERT BOYD and
JOHN STITES

Pursuant to the Eleventh general Rule of the Society the Minutes of the last preceding Meeting were read.

The Committee of Correspondence reported to the Society a draft of a Letter to be sent to such Correspondents as the Society shall think proper which draft being corrected by the Society and finally approved of is in the words following to wit.

New York

As civil and religious Liberty is justly esteemed amongst the greatest of human Blessings, the loss of which must necessarily be attended with the most complicated misery, it cannot be doubted that its preservation merits our most vigorous Efforts. No man duly sensible of its inestimable Value, but will acknowledge it our indispensable Duty, by every lawful means to preserve it to ourselves and transmit it to Posterity.

The History of all ages furnishes abundant and melancholy proofs, that even the best of men (such is the pride and ambition of human nature) have too frequently abused an undue share of power; and that it is therefore an Argument of the Wisdom, as well as productive of the Happiness of a People, to preserve a just Ballance in the different branches of Government, both civil and religious: And though it is well known that most of our Colonies have hitherto held their privileges in tolerable security; Yet no one who is properly sensible of that important Blessing, can help being alarmed at the Attempts lately made by many of the Episcopal Clergy, and some of their Laity, to introduce Bishops into America. They have not only planned their Scheme, but have pursued it as far as our Watchfulness on this side the *Atlantic*, and the political jealousies on the other would permit. And as we have the utmost reason to fear, that they have not abandoned the project, we ought still to be on our Guard, lest our Inattention should facilitate its accomplishment. Should such be the Event, *how terrifying the prospect!* We should soon be obliged to bid farewell to that religious Liberty, in which CHRIST hath set us free; and instead of that divine Satisfaction which flows from the uninterrupted enjoyment of the Rights of private Judgment, and the Worship of God according to our Consciences, (for which some of our forefathers left their native Country, and took sanctuary in this then uncultivated Wilderness, from the oppression of *Ecclesiastical power*) the introduction of Episcopacy would immediately fill our Hearts with just forebodings of Evil. For it is much to be feared, that so extraordinary and dangerous an Innovation, would sooner or later be attended with

such Restraints, impositions and penalties on all Nonconformists as would make Life itself intolerable. The Non-Episcopalians have the greater reason to be alarmed at the Attempt to introduce Episcopacy, when they already see the members of that Church Pursuing measures for ingrossing an inordinate share of power; while themselves, tho ten to one in this Colony, are treated with open Contempt; and publicly told by the warm Advocates of prelacy, that they ought to be tributaries to the Church; nor be suffered to enjoy any post, either of honor, trust, or profit. Our fears are greatly increased, when we consider the Episcopal Church possessed of so immense an Estate in this City; and her members enjoying the Principal part of the wealth of the Metropolis: not that we envy either the Corporation of that Church, or any private member belonging to it, in any part of their Possessions: We only notice their superior riches, as an unfailing Source of Superior influence; an influence sufficient unless opposed by the union of all the other denominations to carry almost every Election here. By the policy of the Constitution, they are secure of the Countenance of the Crown, the Governor and the Council; and consequently of a preference respecting all Officers and favors in the Gift of the Government; while the only security left to their brethren of different persuasions, is to avail themselves of their numbers, and to preserve a Majority in the house of representatives. Of this preference we can need no other Proof, than the Liberality of the Government to them, in the Grant of large Tracts of Land in every new township, for a parsonage glebe, and for the Society for propagating the Gospel; while the churches of every other denomination are refused even the comparatively trifling favor of a Charter, to enable them to enjoy the benefit of private Donations. Of this the Episcopalians are fully sensible; and therefore, though it is evident that where [were] we wholly to engross the representative Body, and fill every Elective Office in the Colony, they by having a triple check upon us would be safe against all possible attempts by those of other persuasions; they are Nevertheless Strenuously Endeavoring to Obtain a Majority in those Elective Offices, in which our only security consists. These Considerations ought to teach those whom they term Dissenters, to make it a maxim of their Conduct, to be jealous of bestowing these Offices on Episcopalians, as thereby they evidently weaken the Grand Bulwark of their Liberty.

These reasons have induced a number of Gentlemen of different denominations to meet, and form themselves into a Society, for the preservation of their common Liberty. We do by no means propose to Act Offensively against the Episcopalians, but barely to Counteract them, as far as we shall discover them pursuing designs unfriendly to our General interest. We can with Great Truth and Sincerity declare, that we would not, if it were in our power, deprive that Church of any Enjoyment save only that of Applying our property to her Support, which she does in four Counties in this province; and has in one of them Attempted to Enlarge her establishment: And we have but too much reason to suspect from her

unwearied pains and struggles for Power, that it is with a View to Obtain an Ascendancy in the House of representatives, sufficient to enable her to make such establishment General through the province ; or to some other designs unfavorable to those of different persuasions. Why else is she not satisfied with her Already disproportionate degree of power before mentioned? We only desire ourselves to enjoy and to transmit to our posterity the right of private Judgment ; and of Worshipping God according to the dictates of our own Consciences. For this important purpose, and to Strengthen our interest, we propose to Write to all our brethren on the Continent, to exhort them to form themselves into such Societies, to Correspond with each other on these Interesting concerns ; and thereby endeavour the preservation of our Common Liberty.

We therefore earnestly intreat you, as you regard the religious liberty of the present and future Generations, to communicate this letter, to some of the leading members of your Congregation ; to use your interest and urge them to use theirs to get as many leading men of the various Non-episcopal Denominations among you as they shall think proper, to erect a similar society, or societies. Let us therefore, Notwithstanding our peculiar religious distinctions, heartily unite for our common Safety.

We who reside in this City and are thereby under superior Advantages of intelligence, will be as Vigilant as possible, in discovering any measures that may be pursued Detrimental to our Liberty ; and give you such information as we shall conceive Subservient to our common cause. We also propose to correspond with our Brethren in Scotland and Ireland, and with the Standing Committee of Dissenters in England, to engage them to favour the design. The latter may have it in their power to do us singular service.

As soon as your Societies are Instituted, we shall be glad to be informed of it, and have the names of their members transmitted to us with directions how to direct to them. Their Letters to us may be directed to ————— Esq. in New York, and sent to us by some safe private hand to save postage, Except on Extraordinary Occasions. We enclose you a Copy of the Articles on which our Society is founded with the names of the members, that you may form yours on the like plan. We would only mention, that the sooner your Societies are formed the sooner we shall be enabled to open our Correspondence, and begin to experience the Salutary effects expected from their institution. We shall from time to time open to them the particular instances in which they may be more peculiarly Serviceable to the Common interest. We Cannot conclude without recommending it to the members of the Societies, to make it a matter of their prayer, that God would bless the design so far as it may tend to promote his Glory and the Good of his people.

We are, with esteem,

P. S. We would inform you that a number of us have lately had reprinted a small treatise written more [than] one hundred years ago, by Thomas Delaune entitled, A plea for the Nonconformists ; sold by Gar-

rat Noel Bookseller in New York at the small price of 1s. 6d. in which the reasons and Grounds of our nonconformity are fully, clearly, and we think unanswerably stated ; and we would recommend it to your society to get a number of them to lend to their Neighbors and Acquaintance, and thereby make them as diffusively useful as possible ; as we think they will have a Good Tendency to Ground and fix them in their principles.

Ordered that a Number of Copies of the said Letter be engrossed before the next Meeting of the Society.

Mr. Moderator appoints Tuesday the 21st Instant for the next meeting of this Society at this House of David Phillips at six of the Clock in the evening.

And Lastly Mr. Peter R. Livingston is elected Moderator for the next Meeting of this Society.

At a meeting of the Society according to appointment of the Moderator at the House of David Phillips the 21st March 1769.

Present PETER R. LIVINGSTON Moderator.

Messrs. SAMUEL LOUDON	WILLIAM LIVINGSTON
ALEXANDER M ^c DOUGALL	JOHN BROOME
PETER V. B. LIVINGSTON	BENJAMIN Y. PRIME
HENRY WILLIAMS	ALEXANDER ROBERTSON
SAMUEL BROOME	JOSEPH HOLLETT
WILLIAM GOFORTH	
JONATHAN BLAKE	
WILLIAM M ^c KINLEY and	
JOHN M ^c KESSON	

Pursuant to the 11th general Rule the Minutes of the last preceding Meeting were read.

A Majority of the Members of this Society who belong to the Presbyterian Church under the pastoral charge of the Revd. Messrs. Rodgers and Treat being present to wit Mr. Moderator Messrs. Peter V. B. Livingston Samuel Broome William Livingston John Broome, Benjamin Y. Prime, Joseph Hollett Alexander McDougall and John McKesson do nominate Doctor Malachi Treat a Gentleman belonging to their particular Church and present him to this Society to be a Member thereof and he is unanimously received accordingly.

Messrs. William McKinley and John Broome introduce Alexander Lime Esq. of Sommerset County in New Jersey as a visiting Friend. The Society receives him accordingly and thanks him for his attendance.

Several Copies of the circular Letter of Correspondence being engrossed and signed brought into the Society were corrected, but there not being a Sufficient Number *ordered* that Committee of Correspondence do meet here on next Tuesday afternoon at three of the Clock to correct such other engrossed Copies of the said Letter and of the plan of this Society as shall then be ready.

Mr. Moderator appoints next Tuesday Evening for the next meeting of this Society at this House of David Phillips at six of the Clock.

And Lastly Doctor Benj. Y. Prime is unanimously elected Moderator for the next Meeting of this Society.

2. *Miranda and the British Admiralty, 1804-1806.*

IN a former volume¹ we printed a group of papers which illustrated Miranda's expedition of 1806 from the point of view of one of the minor participants and victims, a young American who was among those captured off Porto Cabello and imprisoned at Cartagena. The papers now printed, obtained from the Public Record Office at London through the kindness of Mr. Hubert Hall, F.S.A., illustrate the same episode from another and a very interesting point of view, that of the British Admiralty. They are derived from the series of despatches sent to the Secretary of the Admiralty, William Marsden, by the admirals and other commanders on the North America, Jamaica and Leeward Islands stations, and that of the Cape of Good Hope, which at that time was generally understood to include the southeastern coasts of South America.² Those numbered II. to XIX., despatches and enclosures, including letters of Miranda, exhibit with great fullness and clearness the relations which the various British naval officers in American waters bore to his projects, the extent to which they aided him, and, indirectly, the attitude of the Lords of the Admiralty toward his designs. The chief documents hitherto printed illustrating this aspect of the episode are Admiral Cochrane's letter of June 9, 1806, addressed to Miranda,³ and the memorandum issued in July by Governor Hislop of Trinidad.⁴

The document numbered I. has a special interest. It is a memorandum drawn up by Captain, afterward Rear-Admiral, Sir Home Popham, after a conference with Pitt and Melville in October, 1804, a few months before the outbreak of war with Spain. It casts light upon the mutual connection between the various schemes for the revolutionizing of Spanish America which the British government, for both political and economic reasons, from time to time entertained; and in particular upon the connection between the attacks which Miranda in Venezuela and Popham and Beresford at Buenos Ayres were almost simultaneously making.⁵

The thought of the emancipation of Spanish America had been suggested to the British mind by Governor Pownall in his *Memorial*

¹ III. 674-702. We have since learned that other portions of Henry Ingersoll's diary are possessed by the Boston Athenaeum. See *Third Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, A. H. A. 1898, p. 574.

² This was disputed; but see the *Report of the Trial of Sir Home Popham*, London, 1807, p. 102.

³ Antepara, *South American Emancipation*, London, 1810, pp. 213-215.

⁴ *Edinburgh Review*, January, 1809, XIII. 295.

⁵ Also illustrated by Miranda's letter to the cabildo of Buenos Ayres, in Antepara, pp. 273, 274.

of 1780, and, according to John Adams,¹ in the *Crise de l'Europe* of 1783. Indeed, our readers may remember that it was intelligently expounded in a private memorial as early as June, 1741.² It was a thought to kindle the imagination, especially in times when the wealth of Spanish America was greatly exaggerated, and when the North American Revolution was fresh in mind. Miranda laid it before Pitt in 1790, at the time of the Nootka Sound difficulty. In 1804 it was definitely resolved upon, and Sir Home Popham was selected to command an expedition intended to execute it.³ Melville, who had already examined the subject closely in 1796, conferred with Miranda. In October, Popham, in private conference with Pitt and Melville at Wimbledon, "remained the whole evening explaining all General Miranda's views," and was charged to see him again and "to draw up a specific memorial on that subject, and to explain the readiest way of embracing all the views which General Miranda had from time to time submitted to the government."⁴ The memorial thus prepared is that now printed. When Popham, having in 1806 conquered the Cape of Good Hope and ultimately failed at Buenos Ayres, was tried in 1807 by a naval court-martial for having attempted the latter expedition without orders, he laid this memoir before the court for inspection as a part of the evidence in his justification, but on grounds of public policy submitted that it should not be read; and it was neither read aloud nor printed.⁵

I. MEMORANDUM BY CAPTAIN SIR HOME POPHAM.⁶

Sunday Oct 14th 1804

After the conference at Wimbledon⁷ on Friday Night on the subject of South America, and the desire of Lord Melville⁸ to have an interview with General Miranda on Tuesday, I thought it right to see the General for the purpose of obtaining such information as would enable me to state, in the concisest terms possible, the birth and education of General Miranda and his pursuits subsequent to his quitting the Spanish service, with

¹ *Diplomatic Correspondence of 1783-1789*, V. 123.

² *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, IV. 325-328.

³ *Report of his trial*, p. 36.

⁴ *Testimony of Melville*, *ibid.*, pp. 154-157.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 117, 219. See also Theal's *Records of Cape Colony*, V. 389-397.

⁶ Admirals' Despatches, Cape of Good Hope, Vol. 5. Enclosure in Popham's despatch of April 30, 1806, from St. Helena to the Secretary of the Admiralty, which is printed in the *Report of the Trial of Sir Home Popham*, London, 1807, Appendix, Note B. Home Popham (1762-1820), afterward rear-admiral, was at this time commanding the *Antelope*, 50, on the Downs station.

⁷ Conference with Pitt and Dundas. The latter's country residence was at Wimbledon, and near the house on Putney Heath which Pitt at this time occupied.

⁸ Henry Dundas, Viscount Melville, first lord of the admiralty and an intimate friend of Pitt.

the progress he has made up to the present time in the great object which induced him to leave his own country, "The Emancipation of South America from its tyrannical Government its oppressive administration, its arbitrary exactions and the very exorbitant advances on all European articles." And here it may not be amiss to observe, that several partial revolts have taken place in the principal provinces, such as Lima, Caracas, Sante Fe etc., from the year 1780 to 1798; In the first instance they were compromised and the Government broke its faith, but latterly it has been obliged to propose terms of accommodation and to suffer the most violent insurgents to remain unnoticed, which is the strongest picture of the state of the whole country with respect to Spain.

General Miranda was born at Caraccas and is one of the first family's in that country. He received a classical and military education, and in compliment to his family, the King gave him at once a captain's commission in the army; he was then made Aid-de-camp to the Governor-General,¹ and Secretary to the Government of Havannah, in which situation he remained during the American War; here he first received representations from the aggrieved provinces, which at last terminated in specific propositions; to these he did not pay the least attention, in consequence of his publick employment, but quitting the Spanish Service at the conclusion of the War, he on account of some family disputes went to America² when the provinces of Santa Fe and Caracca renewed their addresses to him, and he laid the whole before General's Washington Knox and Hamilton, who promised him every assistance and gave him assurances of raising troops in the province of New England, provided he could persuade Great Britain to assist with her navy.

In 1785 Miranda came to Europe and seeing that England had but just emerged from a long war, he travelled over the continent remaining a certain time in Berlin³ and all the high military schools, studying not only every military principle, but the principles of every Government where he resided. In Russia he had several audiences with the Empress Catherine and communicated to her his views in visiting Europe, with which she was highly pleased and gave him every protection by circular letters to her ambassadors⁴ for the purpose of carrying into effect his philanthropick plan. In 90 he came to England and submitted it to M^r Pitt who he says promised him every support in case of a war with Spain, but the dispute about Nootka Sound terminating amicably, he then went to Paris, in consequence of some letters he had received from the South Americans residing there; assuring him that France was well disposed to

¹ See the letters of Governor-General Cagigal to Rendon, Miranda and Washington, May 18, 26, 1783, in Antepara, *South American Emancipation*, pp. 251-254, and those of A. Gillon in Sparks, *Diplomatic Correspondence of 1783-1789*, VI. 333, 334, 353, 355.

² Marbois, *History of Louisiana*, pp. 149-150, assigns a political reason, derived from contemporary conversation with Miranda at Philadelphia.

³ Correspondence of Miranda and Frederic, September 1785, in Antepara, pp. 42, 43.

⁴ Printed in Antepara, pp. 41, 42.

countenance his project ;¹ and during his negotiation France was attacked by the Allied Armies and he was solicitous to enter into her service, which he did conditionally for one campaign. At the expiration of it he was appointed Governor and Captain General of St Domingo with an army of 12,000 and an adequate fleet for the purpose of co-operating in his enterprise in favour of South America ;² just at this time however the principles of the French Government under which Miranda first engaged having materially altered, and growing every day worse and worse he hesitated to undertake this expedition and during the time of his suspense he foresaw that Spain must be inevitably engaged in the War, and he sent Caro³ and Narigno the two last emissaries that had arrived from South America to London, whither he soon followed them, and immediately renewed his proposition to the British Government, and although he had reason to expect from the assurances he received, that something would be done, especially as M^r King the American minister was taken into the consideration,⁴ and had several conferences with Lord Grenville, yet he was so pressed with letters from South America, that in 1801 he went again to France when he was so disgusted with Bonaparte that he returned to England in 1802 and brought with him two of the latest arrived South American Commissioners, and sent the rest to South America, with the strictest injunctions to his countrymen to remain quiet till some favourable event happened of which he could profit either by the assistance of Great Britain or America as they were the only two countries on which he placed any reliance.

On his arrival in London the British Government offered him immediate aid for the execution of his plan, the articles necessary were purchased and a ship named to carry him out, but at this moment the preliminary Articles of Peace were signed and this enterprise then lay dormant. The Government however offered him fair and honorable means of subsistence, not only for himself but for his countrymen who were in England ; and above all a promise of support whenever an opportunity occurred : this intelligence he sent to South America ; and to his countrymen in Philadelphia ; and he repeated his advice to them to remain quiet and not to encourage any premature measure of revolt.

Since the present war he has had various communications with His Majesty's Ministers and he pressed for permission to accompany M^r King to America, but it was not granted and M^r Vansittart⁵ assured him in the name of the Government, that although the moment was not yet arrived

¹ See Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, III. 157, 175, as to Brissot, Lebrun and Dumouriez.

² Brissot's letter of November 28, 1792, to Dumouriez, *Edinburgh Review*, XIII. 288, Antepara, p. 169, shows that the ministers agreed that this appointment should be made, if Dumouriez would let Miranda go ; but it does not appear that it was made.

³ For Don Pedro Josef Caro, see Miranda's letters of March 24 and August 17, 1798, to John Adams, in Adams's *Works*, VIII. 569, 581.

⁴ See King's *Rufus King*, II. 649-666.

⁵ Nicholas Vansittart, Secretary of the Treasury from March 1801 to April 1804. The British Museum has an extensive correspondence between him and Miranda.

for him to act yet he might send to Trinidad and assure his friends that when it did happen he should have the most liberal co-operation that England could give. I was present at many of his communications with the late administration,¹ and particularly consulted by Mr Secretary Yorke² and just before the change took place a great proportion of the articles which he required were prepared and a ship ordered to be purchased which order was as suddenly countermanded.

When the new Government was formed I sent all the papers I had written on this subject since my first intimate connexion with General Miranda to Lord Melville, and I shall now trouble him with two propositions, the first a military one on a respectable scale comprehending all the points of descent in the pacifick, the Southern Atlantick, and Terra Firma from Asia to Europe; and the other on a more limited footing, dependant on circumstances which can only be decided by the particular disposition of His Majesty's Ministers and the nicety of their feelings reciprocally weighed with the conduct of the French Government on the scale of analogy which any countenance or assistance on our part will bear with the conduct of Spain, when she entered into a compact with France to aid our colonies in establishing their independance; previous and subsequent to this, she supplied the Americans with money from the Havannah, which was of more service to them in accomplishing their object, than all the troops and ships that France employed on this service.

In entering upon the subject of South America it is scarce necessary to call the attention of His Majesty's Ministers to its positive wealth, or its commercial faculties, they have been I am persuaded contemplated over and over again, and a universal anxiety has prevailed to turn this never-failing source of wealth into any channel but the one which at present enjoys it; and I may without any exaggerated calculation suppose that in specie and produce near twenty million sterling is imported into Spain, and two thirds of that at least carried into France, consequently under the peculiar situation that Spain is with respect to that country, she is very little better than the intermediate agent of her own colonies 'till Bonaparte is prepared to offer some political plea for sending an army to Vera Cruz for the purpose of gaining possession of the rich province of Mexico, and putting an effectual stop to any expedition from the United States. If at the same time he can manage either by secret negotiation or particular exertion to throw a force into the Brazils and to this may I presume to add the possibility of a third point, Rio de la Plata, from the Cape of Good Hope or the Mauritius, especially as the force which he has in the East Indies³ can no longer act with any degree of spirit there, and may be recovered from it's panick by a little exertion in a friendly port, If such an operation should ever be realized, the enemy will be in possession of the East, Southeast and N. W. points of that Great Continent of South America (if I may be allowed to call all the

¹ That of Addington.

² Charles Yorke, secretary for war 1801-1803, home secretary 1803-1804.

³ The force under Decaen, which had retired from India to Mauritius and Réunion. See Professor Sloane's article in this REVIEW, IV. 442.

Spanish possessions South America, because in a Geographical Division the line between North and South is drawn I believe across the Isthmus of Darien). Having explained according to my conception what it is possible for France to do let us now examine whether we have it in our power to avert so fatal a calamity, let us see what are our means direct and indirect, how we are to apply them and whether the objects to be obtained are equal to the risk and trouble of attaining them. The idea of conquering South America is totally out of the question, but the possibility of gaining all its prominent points, alienating it from its present European connexions, fixing on some military position and enjoying all its commercial advantages can be reduced to a fair calculation, if not a certain operation; the nerve and spirit which such an enterprize would give to this country if successful are incalculable, the riches that it would bring in, the new sources that it would open for our manufactures and navigation both from Europe and Terra firma, and from Asia to the Pacifick are equally incalculable and the popularity and stability that it would give any Government that undertook it may be estimated from the preceding propositions with the additional satisfaction of knowing that some accounts must be received of the result of its first operation in three months after it sailed from England.

In offering my opinion as to the best points of descent, I beg it may be understood, that they have been previously submitted to General Miranda, and met his fullest approbation. First, Trinidad as a rendezvous for all the operations on Terra Firma between the River Oronoque and Santa Martha which is a little to the Eastward of Carthagina. And here let me observe that the province of Sante Fe de Bogota and the Caracca's on which the General rests his greatest Faith may with their influence be considered to contain all that tract of country from Oronoque West to the Pacific Ocean, about 350 leagues and certainly from the latitude of 11° N to the Line. this will include also Province of Quito which is guided by the same principles as the Caracca's and Santa Fe. . . Our dependance on the disposition of these provinces must rest on the faith we have in the correspondence which has been communicated by General Miranda; I have had a most confidential intercourse with him for some time, and I think his letters and papers are in such a fair and regular succession that no doubt can exist of the fact and as most of the original letters have been shown or transmitted to some part of His Majesty's Government, I shall only insert an extract of a letter from Trinidad, as I am now on the subject of that island, under date the 20th of July last from M^r. Lambert a resident merchant and planter there.

"It appears the ramifications of the project are extended beyond what can be imagined, and so much so that many leading characters have no connexion with others who are employed in the same plans at very remote places from each other so that upon the whole nothing seems to be wanted but a chief, and place de ralliement."

This account was confirmed by M^r. Fitzwilliam a merchant who is just arrived from that place and has had the Honor of seeing Lord Melville,

but he adds that the partizans of this cause in the Island are considerably alarmed at the possible result of a mission sent to the Black Colony of S^t Domingo, they pray for the protection of the British Government which in either case of war or peace will ensure a most beneficial commercial intercourse with the River Oronoque and the neighbouring continent and make the island one of the first possessions in the Western Hemisphere.¹

The mission to which I allude may have been urged probably by some of the emigrants from S^t Domingo resident at the Caraccas, on the depending societies pressing the activity of their countrymen to espouse so good a cause, and stating in stronger colours than it can possibly deserve, the apathy and disinclination of their European Friends.

The force which General Miranda thinks fully sufficient is two thousand infantry two corps of dismounted cavalry, two companies of artillery with permission to raise as many free corps as there are emigrant officers to embody at Trinidad, yet he only asks this force to be at his disposition, not intending to withdraw it from the island but in such proportion as may be found absolutely necessary. I cannot however resist pressing the policy of having such a force ; as it may be proper to establish a permanent English garrison at Caracca or some other place on the coast. The Naval Force to be specifically nominated for this operation should be one 64. or 74. one 50. one frigate, one Sloop of War, two bombs, three gun brigs, two cutters, and three coppered transports, these may carry out the troops to Barbadoes, from whence seasoned troops should be removed to Trinidad—they will also carry out all the stores necessary for this expedition, a list of which has already been submitted by Miranda to Lord Melville. The Naval Force may be curtailed if His Lordship cannot spare it, but with what I have mentioned, there can be no doubt of succeeding in every point of view ; provided always that our expectations of assistance from the Inhabitants are realized. I do not think it an object that the whole of this force should sail until there is a moral certainty of war ; at least till the Cabinet decides that war shall take place at a given time, but it really is an object of the last importance that Miranda should quit this country without a moment's loss of time ; his arrival at Trinidad in the simple character of a settler would give new life and spirit to the principal people in the country and shake in proportion the existing Government of Spain, it would also set aside the doctrine of the French emigrants who have instigated this mission to S^t Domingo and prove by his presence that Great Britain waited only a proper opportunity to give him her countenance and to act in a manner consistent with the policy of the times, and the existing relations between France and Spain.

Before I proceed any further in detail of operations, I shall ask a few simple questions. Is Spain independant of France ? No ! Is she virtually under the dominion and controul of that new Empire ? Yes ! Will France allow her to be on terms of peace with Great Britain one moment

¹ Trinidad had been lately acquired, in 1797.

longer than it is consistent with the views and projects of Bonaparte? No! Does France draw any revenue from South America through Spain? Yes: very great. Would it not materially distress France to cut off that source of wealth? Yes! Would it not considerably benefit Great Britain to throw that source into her scale, and open new channels for the export of her European and Asiatick manufactures? Yes! What supports the Spanish navy with which they are in some respects now bullying us? The treasures and timber of South America and the nursery which that foreign commerce holds out for her seamen. I therefore ask whether the independence of South America will not annihilate the Spanish navy and consequently oppose to us a less confederate force in any future war; If I may be allowed this argument then I can assert that the third naval power in Europe will be destroyed, and that power will consider the injury to have originated with France, against whom she will in course take any opportunity of being revenged that may present itself, in the extraordinary fluctuation of European politicks.

If I may credit the assertion of M^r King the late American Minister, the emancipation of South America in general terms has been acknowledged by some of the leading men in opposition as a measure of extreme policy, and Lord Granville [Grenville] declared to him in the most qualified [? unqualified] terms, that he thought it the greatest object for this country to attend to, and almost the only one to *save her*. This may be a strong expression but it shows that the subject has undergone a great deal of discussion and that nothing has been publicly urged against the policy or expediency of undertaking it on a dignified and extended scale.

I will not enlarge any more either on the advantages to be gained by this Expedition, or the extreme popularity that will attach to it, but confine myself to the intended progress from Trinidad and then notice the other points of descent.

The first operation from Trinidad must depend on two things, local information which must be received on the spot and the force disposable for this service. Miranda has been obliged to change his plan of operations several times, but at present he considers the possession of Leon de Caracca's,¹ as the first point, which will ensure the Port of La Guyra, and if there is any faith to be placed either in his intelligence or expectation, he will in the course of a month be able to raise an army of twenty thousand men, daily increasing especially as he advances into the country which is his present intention, fixing on stations of communication and intercourse with the Squadron. If the provinces of Caracca and Sante Fe,² give him that protection and assistance which he expects he will proceed by the most convenient preconcerted routes to the Isthmus of Darien, and the squadron or a proportion of it with such force as may be embarked from Jamaica will go on to the River Chagra where the Eng-

¹ Santiago de Leon de Carácas, now commonly called Carácas.

² *I. e.*, the captain-generalcy of Venezuela and the viceroyalty of New Granada, whose capital was Santa Fe de Bogota.

lish adventurers landed many years ago,¹ and if the spirit of independence is as active as it is now calculated to be then all the future intercourse will be carried on by Jamaica. It is proposed that this island should send a small force to Santa Martha consisting probably of one thousand men; it is not however the intention of Miranda to take the least notice of Carthagina, Porto Bello, or any of the fortified towns on the coast, as they are in general unhealthy, but means will be adopted to cut off their supplies by the exertion of the people of the country.

The next point from Europe must certainly be Buenos Ayres, and to accomplish this object it will be necessary to have a force of three thousand men, because it must be considered that it is really a military operation to which however some facilities may be given by engaging two or three of the South Americans to attend the Expedition, by way of explaining to their countrymen the great object of this undertaking. Then with respect to the Pacifick Ocean, I consider two points of descent as sufficient, one however might suffice but if the other can be accomplished it will have a great effect upon the people to the Southward of Buenos Ayres. I mean in speaking of this which is on the coast of Chili to propose Valpariso, and if the force for that object could either be concentrated at, or taken from New South Wales, by new levies or otherwise, it would make this proposition perfect. The great force however for the Pacifick which I will propose to come from India and to consist of 4000 Sepoys and a small proportion of Europeans should direct its course to Panama, which is fixed upon as the point of concentration for all our forces, and from this point with the assistance of the ships from India and the Spanish ships that we can procure in the South Sea, communications will be immediately made all along the coast to the Southward as far as Lima, and means of assistance given to the country to establish itself in all the positions which may be thought worthy of attention.

On the first view this may appear a very complex undertaking, but I think it may be simplified and brought into a very narrow compass, and certainly the principal point which is Trinidad attended to without the least suspicion. The three regiments may sail from Ireland for the West Indies. The ship to carry out the General and whoever may be Governor of Trinidad and Commanding Officer of the Navy, rendezvous at Cowes, fitted for foreign service, and if she has an acting captain the whole may be done with the greatest secrecy and Miranda embark for [from] Lymington. An arrangement must be made about the Royal treasures which I think ought to go to the Crown for the expence of the equipment, this however and a variety of other details may be entered into when it is determined to undertake the great national object. And if one confidential person of Government is fixed on to make all the arrangements, with power to apply to each of the officers, I pledge myself that the whole on the most extended scale, shall be ready to sail in fourteen days. If however any reasons of moment should be urged against this plan superior to the probable advantages already described of

¹ At the end of 1670, when Morgan's men took Chagre on their way to Panama.

ultimately annihilating one fleet, of cutting off fifteen millions from the Revenue of France, and probably adding it to our own, and raising in that proportion our consequence in Europe, Then I submit the propriety of taking up without a moment's loss of time the consideration of Trinidad as a colony, a naval station, a military and commercial position with respect to Oronoque and the Caracca's. And then send Miranda there, and ascertain the countenance or assistance that it will be expedient to give him personally, for I think no more imputation can attach to any moveable protection than does already by keeping him here for this specifick purpose, to apply him and his resources, whenever it shall be considered that this country is politically justified in doing so.

II. WILLIAM ARMSTRONG TO CAPTAIN EDWARD MOORE.¹

Leander, Lat. 28, 12th Feb. 1806

My dear Moore,

I wrote you twice lately from New York from whence I sailed on the 2nd inst. informing you of my having engaged in a spec in which I wished you to take a part.

Having just fallen in with the *Cleopatra* I embrace the opportunity of saying I am now on my way with a number of very good fellows to put it in execution and provided we meet with no unexpected interruption have little doubt of success. If therefore you wish to put yourself in fortune's way come to me as soon as possible, I shall keep the situation I mentioned vacant for you and you may rest assured nothing in my power (which is not trifling) shall be left undone to serve you.

If you come get to Barbadoes or Trinidad as soon as possible; at the first you will hear of me from Phill Amiel [?] to be found at Conders, the other from W^m M. or Lambth.

I will thank you to write to M^{rs} A and inform her we are all well and desire her to communicate it to S. and all my friends.

If the Admiral or Capt Beresford is with you remember me to them, tell the last I saw G. R. very well the day I embarked. You will probably meet W^m A. T. remember me to all friends with you and believe me unalterably yours.

W. A.

All friends at New York were well excepting J. C. P. who is on his last legs.

Capt. Edw. Moore
Bermuda

¹ Admirals' Despatches, North America, Vol. 17. Probably an enclosure in Captain Wight's letter, No. iv., *post*. The writer was no doubt William Armstrong, a half-pay captain of the British army whom Miranda made "colonel of the first regiment of riflemen in the Columbian army" and his quartermaster-general. See Biggs, *History of Don Francisco de Miranda's Attempt*, Boston, 1810, pp. 17, 19, 237, 238, 245.

III. MIRANDA TO ADMIRAL SIR A. MITCHELL.¹à bord la *Cleopatre* ce 13 février 1806.*Monsieur l'Amiral,*

Un accident nous ayant fait rencontrer la *Cleopatre* dans notre route de New York aux cotes de l'Amerique Meridionale; je me suis trouvé sous la necessité de lui communiquer des affaires secretes et de la plus haute importance; que nous sommes sur le point de mettre à execution avec la connoissance et assentiment tacite du Gouvernement de la Grande Bretagne—et c'est par la manifestation des documens que j'ai avec moi qu'a Captain Wight a bien voulu consentir à nous laisser poursuivre cet important objet. j'espere que cette communication indispensable restera entre lui et vous dans un secret inviolable pour le present; et que s'il etait compatible avec vos instructions de le laisser venir le Captain Wight avec sa fregate pour cooperer par la suite, cela seroit aussi important pour votre Pay qu'agreable et satisfaisant au mien.

Je suis avec grande consideration Monsieur l'Amiral, votre très humble et tres obt. servt.

FRAN. DE MIRANDA.

Amiral Sir A. Michel K. B.

TRANSLATION OF THE PRECEDING.²*Sir*

Having by accident fallen in with the *Cleopatra* in our way from New York to the coast of South America, I found myself under the necessity of communicating to her secret affairs of the highest importance which we are upon the point of transacting with the knowledge and consent of the Government of Great Britain. Captain Wight in consequence of the manifestation of documents which I have with me has thought proper to allow us to pursue our voyage on this important business.

I hope Sir, that this unavoidable communication will remain an inviolable secret between you and him; and if it be consistent with your instructions to send Capt. Wight with his frigate to cooperate with us in the end; it will prove equally important to your country as agreeable and satisfactory to mine.

I am with the greatest consideration Sir

Your very obedient humble servant

FRA.^s DE MIRANDA.

¹ Admirals' Despatches, North America, Vol. 17. Apparently an enclosure in Captain Wight's letter, No. iv., *post.* Admiral Sir Andrew Mitchell had been commander-in-chief on the North American station since 1802. He died at Bermuda on February 26, 1806.

² Also apparently an enclosure in Captain Wight's letter.

IV. CAPTAIN JOHN WIGHT TO CAPTAIN JOHN POO BERESFORD.¹

Sir

His Majesty's ship under my command on a cruize to the Southward of the Island of Bermuda on the 19th January 1806² fell in with a vessel called the *Leander* under American colours with about 220 men on board, and mounted with twenty guns, cleared out for Jaquemelle Island of St Domingo in possession of the blacks, having as a cargo, thirty pieces of cannon some thousand pikes, pistols, cutlasses, sadles, and all other sorts of warlike implements, printers, and printing presses the whole under the direction of General Miranda and a Major Armstrong of Col. Williamsons corps.³

As there may many doubts arise respecting the real destination of this vessel, I beg to acquaint you that I examined Miranda very closely and that he produced me letters, from Alexander Davidson, Esq. of St James Square whose signature I knew who had mentioned his project to Sir Evean Nepean,⁴ Sir Home Popham, M^r. Vansitart, and that the said project was in the confidence of His Majesty's Minister, the Right Honble. William Pitt and that M^r. Vansitart's note to Miranda particularly mentioned his conference with the minister on this subject advising Miranda to make his point of attack from the United States. Miranda also produced me his proclamation in the Spanish tongue,⁵ which he was to present to the inhabitants of New Spain also their constitution [which?] as he said had undergone considerable alteration by the Ministers own hand. he also stated to me that he left England with about six thousand pounds and he produced me copies of bills drawn since his arrival at New York for the four different sums of five hundred pounds each on M^r. Vansitart, and from the private conversation of the General and myself he fully appeared to me to be a person in the confidence of the Ministry. I did deliberately consider the same and permitted the said vessel, troops, cannon, pikes, and men to pass unmolested, to proceed to Jaquemell and from thence to Laquira [La Guaira] under the auspices of Miranda to revolutionize that district and the Caraccas under a promise to me that on the event of his success the ports of that country should be open to the commerce of Great Britain, from whence he had drawn his present sources of money.

¹ Admirals' Despatches, North America, Vol. 17; enclosure in Beresford's despatch of March 5, No. v., *post*. Captain Beresford, afterward admiral, acted as senior officer on the North American station after the death of Admiral Mitchell.

² February 12 according to the preceding letters, Biggs, pp. 10-13, and Henry Ingersoll in this REVIEW, III. 679. The *Leander* did not sail from New York till February 2.

³ The corps which Colonel Adam Williamson, governor of Jamaica, formed for service in Santo Domingo.

⁴ Alexander Davison was a well-known government contractor, the prize-agent and confidential friend of Nelson, but convicted of peculation in 1807. Sir Evan Nepean was from 1804 to 1806 one of the lords of the admiralty.

⁵ Antepara, pp. 202-205; John H. Sherman, *General Account of Miranda's Expedition*, pp. 35-39; Biggs, pp. 125-131; *Adventures and Sufferings of Moses Smith*, Brooklyn, 1812, p. 22.

So great a consideration as this wherein I judged the distresses of the enemy would be enormous and that the benefit arising to Great Britain so incalculable I did take upon myself although she had no commission or pass to permit her to proceed on the policy of the measure, that however much I might suffer from not making a capture of her, yet as a servant of the crown I conceived it my duty not to make any exposition of this secret nature before any Court of Admiralty. I have but to request you will be pleased to make a communication to His Majesty's ministers of this subject, that I might know whether my transactions are such as they will approve of, I also enclose you the General's letters requesting assistance.

I have the honor to be Sir
Your most obedient humble
servant

JOHN WIGHT

John Poo Beresford Esq.

Commander in Chief of his Majesty's Ships and Vessels.

V. CAPTAIN BERESFORD TO THE SECRETARY.¹

Cambrian, BERMUDA,
5th March 1806.

Sir

I think it my duty to forward the enclosed statement from Captain Wight of His Majesty's Ship *Cleopatra*, for the information of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty.

The *Leander* has evaded the cruizers of this squadron, ever since the war began, and has continually taken gun powder and warlike stores to the enemy,² and returned to New York with colonial produce, and it appears to me in this instance they have outwitted Captain Wight for M^r Vansittart has been long out of office,³ and at that time M^r Pitt was not the Minister. I have looked over all the late Admiral's papers. I cannot find any communication from M^r Merry⁴ to the Admiral on the subject.

I have the honor to be Sir
Your most obedient humble servant
J. P. BERESFORD.

W^m Marsden Esq.
Admiralty, London.

¹ Admirals' Despatches, North America, Vol. 17. William Marsden, the Orientalist, editor of *Marco Polo*, was first secretary to the admiralty from 1804 to 1807.

² See this confirmed in *The Trial of William S. Smith and Samuel G. Ogden*, New York, 1807, p. 253.

³ Vansittart had left the treasury in April, 1804.

⁴ British Minister at Washington.

VI. REAR-ADMIRAL SIR ALEXANDER COCHRANE TO THE SECRETARY.¹

Dolphin, Carlisle Bay,
BARBADOES, 12 April '06

Sir

Information has arrived from Trinidad that General Miranda with an expedition fitted out in America has made a descent on the Island of Margaritta where he was joined by about 3000 men and that he was on his way to attack Cumana and Barcelona.² The report also states there was every appearance that the Insurrection would be general.³

Being unacquainted with the nature of this Expedition I conceived it my duty to write him a letter of which the enclosed is a copy, and should it be the intention of Government to support him, the sooner I obtain instructions the better, as a little assistance at the beginning may render the Expedition successful.

I have the honor to be Sir

Your most obedient

humble servant

ALEX. COCHRANE.

VII. CAPTAIN THOMAS JOHN COCHRANE TO REAR-ADMIRAL COCHRANE.⁴

Extract of a letter from Captain Cochrane of H. M. Ship *Jason* dated 23rd April 1806.

"Since writing to you from Trinidad, I have received no satisfactory information respecting General Miranda. At Cumana they seem in a most terrible fright for fear of his landing.⁵ in fact Cagegal⁶ told Lieu^t Briarly the country never was in such a state before; he also said they had intelligence of this General being at St Domingo taking on board a number of blacks to assist him.

"Whether there is any truth in it,⁷ or whether he only does it to give us a bad idea of Miranda's designs I cannot say, but a few days must bring everything to light."

¹ Admirals' Despatches, Leeward Islands, Vol. 25. Endorsed as received June 2. Cochrane was commander-in-chief at the Leeward Islands, with his flag on the *Northumberland*.

² This information was erroneous. Miranda's expedition had at this time just reached Aruba. Biggs, p. 55.

³ Regarding this, an important point in estimating the expedition, see letter of Lieutenant J. Murray, November 6, 1807, in the *Monthly Review* for March 1809, LVIII. 307, 308; Lieutenant Briarly's letter of May 2, 1806, No. VIII., *post*; and Marshall's *Naval Biography*, X. 407.

⁴ Enclosure in Rear-Admiral Cochrane's despatch of May 8; see No IX., *post*. The writer was the admiral's son.

⁵ See the intercepted letters printed in Biggs, pp. 239-241, and in Sherman's *General Account of Miranda's Expedition*, p. 41; also Briarly's letter of May 2, No. VIII., *post*.

⁶ "Governor" (footnote in the manuscript).

⁷ Miranda seems to have enlisted no blacks at Jacmel.

VIII. LIEUTENANT BRIARLY TO REAR-ADMIRAL COCHRANE.¹

Extract of a letter from Lieut. Briarly dated 2nd May who was at Cumana on the 20th and 21st of April in a flag of truce.

"The country is in a dreadful state, an embargo on every vessel on this coast, no person suffered to quit their dwelling on pain of death, every person under arms that are able to bear them, the prisons full of Miranda's friends and in short everything in the greatest confusion imaginable. In the meantime no person has any knowledge of the present situation of Miranda nor is it even conjectured in which part of the West Indies he is. this I am certain, he has a multitude of friends who will join him the moment he appears. I fear much delay will injure his plans."

IX. REAR-ADMIRAL SIR ALEXANDER COCHRANE TO THE SECRETARY.²

Dolphin, Carlisle Bay,
BARBADOES, 8th May 1806

Sir,

I have the honor to enclose extracts of two letters which I this day received³ respecting General Miranda by which it appears he has not yet landed on the Spanish Main, though he is evidently expected there shortly, as they are under a general alarm, and seem to be much on the alert; I cannot learn where he is at Present.

The Canada, Ettalion and Circe arrived here this morning but were not fortunate enough to fall in with the four French frigates that arrived in those seas lately and I then understood were at Guadeloupe, but Captain Harvey (of the Canada) informs me he has passed round Martinique and Guadeloupe and ascertained that they are not at either of those islands, he has also called at Antigua and St. Kitts and could obtain no intelligence of them whatever, I therefore conclude they have stood on to the Northward to endeavor to intercept our homeward bound trade.

I have the honor to be Sir

Your most obedient humble servant

ALEX. COCHRANE

X. CAPTAIN DONALD CAMPBELL TO REAR-ADMIRAL COCHRANE.⁴

His Majesty's Sloop "*Lilly*"

N. P^t Barbadoes S. E. by S. Dist 65 Miles, 4th June 1806.

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you on the 26th day of May when in sight of Grenada I fell in with the American Ship Leander having on

¹ Enclosure in Cochrane's despatch of May 8; No. IX., *post*.

² Admiral's Despatches, Leeward Islands, Vol. 25. Endorsed as received June 20.

³ See *ante*, Nos. VII. and VIII., of April 23 and May.

⁴ Copy. Enclosed in Rear-Admiral Cochrane's despatch of June 6; see *post*, No. XI. For Captain Donald Campbell and his services to the expedition, see Marshall, *Naval Biography*, X. 399-413, where letters of Miranda and others are printed.

board General Miranda and loaded with pieces of ordnance and military stores ; from his having on board but one cask of water and being short of provisions I took him under convoy and after touching at Grenada and consulting with His Excellency General Maitland¹ and consistent with General Miranda's own wishes, I am now making the best of my way to Barbadoes with the Leander under convoy. General Miranda has made one unsuccessfull attempt to land on the coast of Caraccas to leeward of Port of Cavella where he unfortunately met a Spanish brig and schooner, Guada coasters.² they took two schooners he had in company having on board ordnance and military stores, and sixty of his most confidential officers and men.³

The Master of the Leander appears to me a perfect pirate in idea, the crew perfectly disatisfied and nearly in a state of mutiny, nor does there appear the smallest credit attached the Expedition.

The Leander mounts eighteen brass nine pounders and has now in all on board about one hundred persons. I chased the Leander thirty-six hours nor should I then have come up with her had the Lilly not been favoured by winds.

General Miranda has produced no document from the British or any other [government] authorizing his expedition. he acknowledges having been some weeks at Jacomel S^t Domingo where he appears to have been disappointed in his expectations of augmenting his force, there is not a native of that colony on board the Leander.

I have the honor to be Sir

Your most obedient humble servant

D CAMPBELL.

XI. REAR-ADMIRAL SIR ALEXANDER COCHRANE TO THE SECRETARY.⁴

Northumberland, Carlisle Bay,

BARBADOES, 6th June 1806.

Sir

I enclose for the consideration of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty copy of intelligence sent me by General Beckwith from S^t Vincent, which adds to the authenticity of that enclosed in my letter no 147 ; and I do not think it improbable as they were steering N N W before they spoke the American vessel, that they may call at these islands in their way to Europe : a strong squadron is certainly expected by every intelligence I can collect, but whether it is the above-mentioned or that said to be fitting at Rochfort, I am yet unable to find out.

¹ Major-General Frederick Maitland, lieutenant-governor of Grenada.

² Guarda-costas.

³ Their fortunes may be followed in the letters of Ingersoll, the narratives of Sherman and Moses Smith, and the anonymous account in the *Monthly Magazine* for March, 1809. After losing them, April 28, Miranda had made for Bonair, and then sailed about the eastern Caribbean ; Biggs, 69-93.

⁴ Admirals' Despatches, Leeward Islands, Vol. 25. Marked as received July 12.

I also enclose a copy of a letter I have this moment received from Captain Campbell of His Majesty's Sloop "Lilly"¹ by which it will appear General Miranda has been hitherto unsuccessful in his attempt on the Spanish main; as the Leander is now with the Lilly, I expect him here in a day or two² and I should be glad to receive their Lordships instructions respecting him.

I have the honor to be Sir, your most obed^t hble. serv^t,

ALEX. COCHRANE.

XII. REAR-ADMIRAL SIR ALEXANDER COCHRANE TO THE SECRETARY.³

Northumberland, off Port Royal Bay,
MARTINIQUE, 12 June 1806.

Sir

Be pleased to inform the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty that previous to my leaving Barbadoes, General Miranda arrived in an armed ship under American colours, from an unsuccessful attempt he made to land near Porto Cavello in consequence of the Spanish Naval Force being superior to the vessels he sent in shore.

Conceiving every attempt to annoy the enemy as beneficial to Great Britain, I have agreed to protect his landing by a sloop of war and two armed brigs, and when the convoys are safe, with a frigate if I have one to spare; I have also directed the Commanders of those vessels, to receive on board as many of his recruits as they can carry.⁴

It is not yet determined where the descent is to be, but I suppose near to Cumana, unless it should be decided to begin with Angostura:⁵ By accounts from the Continent many are ready to join him as soon as he makes good his landing.

I hope the measure I have adopted may be agreeable to their Lordships.

I have the honor to be Sir

Your most obed^t humble servant

ALEX. COCHRANE.

¹ See the preceding, No. x.

² He arrived on the sixth.

³ Admirals' Despatches, Leeward Islands, Vol. 25. Endorsed as received July 12.

⁴ Cochrane's engagement to this effect, dated June 9, 1806, may be found in Antepara, pp. 213-215, with Miranda's reply. After the above stipulation, Cochrane adds: "I do moreover assure you of such further support as it may be in my power occasionally to give." But the article on the Emancipation of Spanish America in the *Edinburgh Review* for January 1809, an article which Copinger attributes to "Milner assisted by General Miranda," says, XIII. 295, that after a little time the admiral wrote to him, that "by recent instructions received from England, he was directed to limit the assistance General Miranda was to receive from him, to protection from the naval force of the enemy, to prevent succours being landed, and to secure his re-embarkation, in the event of his being obliged to leave the shore." That Fox, the new Foreign Secretary, was disposed to be cautious in support of Miranda is evident from his conversation with Monroe on June 7; see *Writings of James Monroe*, IV. 450.

⁵ Santo Thomé de la Angostura, on the Orinoco; now Ciudad Bolívar.

XIII. MIRANDA TO VICE-ADMIRAL JAMES R. DACRES.¹

(Copy No. 2).

Sir,

CORO, 6th Aug. 1806.

We arrived at the Port of La Vela de Coro on the 1st inst. The landing that was to take place that night was by the mistake of the pilots deferred 'till the next day, and by the stress of weather unavoidably retarded until the 3rd at daylight.

These circumstances gave time to the agents of the Spanish Governments to collect all the forces they could command in the circumjacent country for the purpose of opposing us.

We effected it however, in spite of all their opposition, with the force of 100 men against 400, we stormed the fort of St Peter and carried a redoubt just above it with a battery also on the shore in less than an hour's time. The enemy left us in absolute possession of the town, port, 200 pieces of artillery, ammunition etc.

The inhabitants soon came to us and having been informed of our friendly and patriotic intentions, filled the town with satisfaction, and many of the Indians that served with the enemy joined us with alacrity, in a few hours afterwards. With this force two hundred additional men, and two field pieces, we marched at 10 o'clock P.M. towards the City of Coro (12 miles from La Vela) and before daylight the next day we took possession of it without any resistance. The Commandant Solas with his troops fled towards the interior mountains and left us in quiet possession of the capital and principal port of the province. this operation only required 24 hours time.

The desire of showing confidence and friendship to the inhabitants may induce us in a short time to withdraw the troops from the town toward the sea shore for the purpose of keeping a regular communication with the navy, and following our operations in concert, towards Puerto Cavello, and Caraccas.

I cannot express the satisfaction I feel in seeing the zeal, harmony and good understanding, that has constantly prevailed between the troops and the navy officers during the whole time we have been with Captain Campbell. Those officers that superintended the landing of the troops, and the piquets of the navy under Lieu^t Bedingfield distinguished themselves as worthy members of that body.

I am with high respect and great consideration,

Sir,

Your most obedient, most humble servant

FRAN. DE MIRANDA

¹ Admirals' Despatches, Jamaica, Vol. 24. Enclosure in Dacres's letter of August 30 to the Secretary, No. XVII., *post*. Vice-Admiral Dacres was commander-in-chief on the Jamaica station. Toward the end of June Miranda and his British allies sailed from Barbadoes, toward the end of July from Trinidad to Coro. Other accounts of the actions at Coro may be found in Biggs, pp. 109-151, in a letter of Captain Donald Campbell printed in Marshall's *Naval Biography*, X. 404-405, and in a letter written from Aruba, August 23, by an officer in Miranda's corps to his brother in New York, and printed by Sherman, pp. 113-118.

XIV. MIRANDA TO VICE-ADMIRAL DACRES.¹

Head Quarters, LA VELA DE CORO,
8th August 1806.

Sir,

The object of this despatch is to inform you that we are in possession of this port, and of the greatest part of the Province of Coro. That we consider ourselves independent of Spain, and the friends of Great Britain ; as you will see by the enclosed documents that I send to you for the purpose of giving a correct insight into the state of our connexions with the Government of England :—requesting you to keep them in the secrecy and privacy they ought to be.

Before I quitted England in September last with the idea of executing this enterprise, it was agreed with the late Ministry² that I was to acquaint you, as well as the Admiral Commanding on the Windward Station, with my landing on the Coasts of South America, [? to free it] from the disgraceful and oppressive yoke of France.

The chief support I want at the present moment is detailed in my enclosed private letter to Admiral Cochrane.

I hope that between you and the Governor of Jamaica we shall receive if not the whole at least part of the troops and naval assistance we are so much in want of at this present moment for the speedy success of this important enterprise.

We had the happiness of being assisted in our landing by the *Bacchante* Frigate, Capt. Dacres³ and some of his crew ; which incident contributed very much to our farther success, in taking possession of the City of Coro, the Metropolis of the Province.

I have the honour to be with high respect and consideration

Sir

Your most obed^t and

most humble ser^t

FRAN : DE MIRANDA.

XV. MIRANDA TO VICE-ADMIRAL DACRES.⁴

(Copy)

LA VELA DE CORO,
8th Aug. 1806.

My dear Admiral,

After having been obliged to quit Trinidad on the 24th ult. with only the increase of 80 men volunteers in our troops, I could not attempt

¹ Admirals' Despatches, Jamaica, Vol. 24. Enclosure in Dacres's despatch of August 30 to the Secretary, No. XVII., *post*.

² That of Pitt, which had ended with his death on January 23, 1806, and had been succeeded by that of Grenville and Fox.

³ James R. Dacres, son of the vice-admiral ; see Biggs, pp. 114, 115, 154. He afterward commanded the *Guerrière* in her fight with the *Constitution*, in 1812.

⁴ Admirals' Depatches, Jamaica, Vol. 24. Enclosure in Dacres's despatch of August 30 to the Secretary, No. XVII., *post*.

any fortified place on the coasts nor even the Island of Margaritta with any probability of success: on that supposition we came to Coro where we have compleatly succeeded in the first instance and notwithstanding a concatenation of blunders in pilots and our raw land officers that is really unaccountable. The people of the country are very well disposed to join us in this enterprise for their own sake, but at the same time they are excessively shy, seeing that our troops are so few in number and that we may ultimately be driven out of the country, and leave them totally destitute of protection.

If I had with me only one regiment of Infantry, and one or two squadrons of cavalry with one company of Artillery, the whole might be settled in a few days and our success would be compleatly obtained. I have evacuated the town of Coro with the view of inspiring confidence to the inhabitants, and going back again if necessary after having received a reinforcement of troops.

In the secret correspondence that I intercepted at Coro, at the Commandant's House, I find in a letter dated 11th July 1806 the following intelligence.

"Via (?) abia noticia venida de Puerto Cavello por un barco procedente de Martinica que dicen ha llegado alli, notician que los Franceses han conquistado a Portugal cuio Reyno cede la Francia â nos ostros y en remplazo le damos esta Provincia."¹ If this information is true (which would not surprise me in the present circumstances) this province instead of belonging to us as was intended, will become a province of France, and the footstool for the invasion of the whole South American Continent. We have no time to lose, my dear Admiral, send me the reinforcements I mention to you in this letter and we shall be at Caraccas before the month expires.

I mean to hold on to this coast, and to keep some of the small ports, until I hear from you, and to direct my steps toward Puerto Cavello by the Sea Shore, in proportion as I shall receive reinforcements from you, from Jamaica or any where else: I am expecting to descry the Jason every moment or some other frigate that will give support to our gallant small squadron, with instructions that may enable the commanders to land a portion of their seamen, and support our efforts on shore, as Captain Campbell has so willingly and so usefully done.

Any side or fire arms are most necessarily wanted at this moment to give to the people that most anxiously demand them.

I am with the greatest respect and affection etc.

FRAN. DE MIRANDA.

¹ *I. e.*, apparently, "—have news from Puerto Cabello by a bark said to have arrived there from Martinique, that the French have conquered Portugal, which country France cedes to us [Spain], and in return we give her this province [meaning, probably, the captain-generalship of Carâcas].

XVI. VICE-ADMIRAL JAMES R. DACRES TO MIRANDA.¹

Copy.

His Britanic Majesty's Ship *Pique*,
PORT ROYAL, JAMAICA, August [24], 1806.

Sir,

I was on the 15th Inst. honoured with your letter of the 8th from Vela de Coro, with its enclosures, by your Aid de Camp Cap^t Leslie.²

The force on this station being very considerably less than the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty are aware of, I do not feel myself justified in lessening it in support of an enterprise, of which I have not the slightest information from my Government, at the risque of neglecting the services required of the squadron I have the honor to command, which must be the case in rendering you the assistance you require.

I have hurried the equipment of a cruizer for Cap^t Leslie's passage to Vela de Coro, and have ordered her commander to cruize on the coast of the Caraccas as much as possible to add to your security, while on the coast, from any attack that might be made by a junction of the Gua[r]da Coasters, or any inconsiderable force of the enemy.

I have the honor to be with high respect and consideration Sir
Your obedient humble servant

J. R. DACRES.

XVII. VICE-ADMIRAL JAMES R. DACRES TO THE SECRETARY.³

Shark, PORT ROYAL,⁴ 30th August 1806

Sir

I have the honour to transmit herewith for the information of the Right Honorable the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, copies

¹ Admirals' Despatches, Jamaica, Vol. 24. Enclosure in Dacres's letter of August 30 to the Secretary, No. XVII., *post*. Biggs, p. 180, mentions the arrival of H. B. M. brig *Ferret* at Aruba on September 13, with this letter and a similar one from the governor of Jamaica.

² Biggs, pp. 48, 158, mentions James F. *Ledlie*, "captain in the First Regiment of (North American) infantry." *Ledlie* is also the name given in the *Annual Register* for 1806, pp. 317, 318.

³ Admirals' Despatches, Jamaica, Vol. 24. Of the enclosures mentioned, the first is Rear-Admiral Cochrane's letter to Miranda, dated Barbadoes, June 9, in which he, in view of the nature of Miranda's plans and the favorable attention which the British has given them, agrees to support the latter's landing on the Main between Trinidad and Aruba with at least a sloop of war and two brigs, and to give other aid, expecting in return that the British (and the people of the United States if Miranda desires) shall be permitted, if independence is established, to import goods at the same rate of duty as natives, while the French and their allies are excluded, and other nations pay a rate ten per cent. higher. This document is here omitted, having been already printed in Antepara's *South American Emancipation*, pp. 213-215. The second enclosure, of the same date, is Miranda's acceptance of the terms, and is omitted for the same reason; see Antepara, p. 215. The other enclosures are, apparently, Miranda's letters dated Coro, August 6, and La Vela de Coro, August 8, and Dacres's reply of August [24], for all which see *ante*, Nos. XIII., XIV., XV. and XVI.

⁴ Jamaica.

of a letter and several enclosures I received from General Miranda, on the *Raposa's* return from her cruize, also a copy of my answer, with which I despatched His Majesty's Sloop *Ferret* on the 24 inst.¹

I am Sir

Your obed^t. humble servant

J^A. R. DACRES.

To William Marsden Esq.

XVIII. REAR-ADMIRAL SIR ALEXANDER COCHRANE TO THE SECRETARY.²

Northumberland, Carlisle Bay,
BARBADOES, 11th September 1806.

Sir,

I have to acquaint you for the information of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty with the return of His Majesty's Ships named in the margin to this anchorage on the 10th after having seen the convoy safe to the Latitude of Bermuda and left it about fifty leagues to the northward of that island on the 19th ultimo.

As a line of battleship, one frigate and a corvette were seen going into Fort Royal Bay, Martinique, about eight days ago, I have directed Captain Harvey of the *Canada* to take the *Seine* under his orders and proceed off that port.

The *Elephant* will leave this tomorrow for Jamaica; and I shall give Captain Dundas orders to call off Fort Royal and should the enemy's ships have left that bay, to take with him the *Seine*; and make the best of his way off Coro near to Marycaibo where General Miranda has landed³—the particulars of which is enclosed, and such intelligence as I have been able to collect:—My reasons for ordering the *Elephant* on this service is from a report that the enemy's ships are to proceed there to defeat the Expedition.

Should Captain Dundas not find them there he is to go from thence to Jamaica. By him I have sent extracts of your letter of the 19th of July⁴ and a copy of Lord Howick's of the same date, for the guidance of Vice-Admiral Dacres, within whose district General Miranda has landed.

The *Pickle* Schooner accompanies the *Elephant* in order to convey to England the most recent accounts from the Spanish Main.

I have the honor to be Sir,

Your most obed. humble servant

ALEX. COCHRANE.

¹ Biggs, p. 180, mentions the arrival of the *Ferret* at Aruba, with despatches, on September 13.

² Admirals' Despatches, Leeward Islands, Vol. 25. Marked as received October 26.

³ Evacuating the Main on August 13, Miranda had occupied the island of Aruba, where Biggs, p. 181, under date of September 21, reports the *Elephant* as having just sailed for Jamaica and the *Pickle* for England.

⁴ Probably that alluded to in note 4 on p. 524.

XIX. REAR-ADMIRAL SIR ALEXANDER COCHRANE TO THE SECRETARY.¹

Northumberland, Carlisle Bay,
BARBADOES, 4th Nov., 1806.

Sir,

Be pleased to inform the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty that an establishment of privateers is formed at the Port of Cayenne, at present they consist of one ship, the *Victoire* of 32 guns and 180 men; His Majesty's late sloop *Favorite*; a brig of 16 guns and 120 men, and two stout schooners.

They cruise in a situation from that port to windward of Barbadoes, so as to be able to regain it with their prizes, which they never send to any of their islands to leeward.

I beg leave to recommend that the packets may keep to the north of Latitude 15° until they come nearly into the Longitude of this Island, to avoid the enemy's cruisers, which are now become more numerous than ever, and of greater force.

I am sorry to say that they have been particularly successful of late and have made some most valuable captures. The taking of the mast ship will enable them to send more cruisers to sea.

General Miranda is returned from Aruba and is going down to Trinidad.²

I have the honor to be Sir

Your most obedient humble servant

ALEX. COCHRANE.

¹ Admirals' Despatches, Leeward Islands, Vol. 25. Marked as received December 13.

² The *Leander* left Aruba September 27, under convoy of the British ship *La Seine*, in which Miranda arrived at Barbadoes on November 2. In a few days he sailed for Trinidad, where he remained till December, 1807, when he returned to London. Biggs, pp. 208, 209, 248. So ended in failure the Miranda Expedition of 1806.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Historical Jurisprudence: An Introduction to the Systematic Study of the Development of Law. By GUY CARLETON LEE, Ph.D. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Pp. xv, 517.)

THIS is an interesting book and a good book. It is scholarly in treatment and useful in its material; it shows the marks of broad and thorough study of the subject, and is clearly arranged and perspicuously written. It should prove a useful elementary text-book for the study of Roman law or of early English institutions.

The book is so good that one feels rather provoked with Dr. Lee for not attempting less and making it better. He has collected here facts about many systems of law, from that of old Babylon to that of contemporary Germany. He has tried to indicate the relation between these systems, and the growth of legal conceptions from the primitive notions of barbarians to modern times. That these great tasks cannot be satisfactorily accomplished in one small volume is obvious. That Dr. Lee has failed to accomplish them does not prove his work ill-done; it proves his plan unduly ambitious.

In the Introduction Dr. Lee has stated his purpose to "trace through all the tangled mazes which separate the two, the line of connection between the modern and the primitive conceptions of law;" "to discover the first emergence of those legal conceptions which have become a part of the world's common store of law, to show the conditions that gave rise to them, to trace their spread and development, and to point out those conditions and influences which modified them in the varying course of their existence." "Laws are . . . easily transplanted from one nation to another by the simple intercourse of commercial life;" "this exchange of legal conceptions, and often of actual laws, is part of the subject of Historical Jurisprudence; and by it is established the postulate of jurisprudence, that there is an abstract and universal science of right and justice to which all local and temporary systems conform, and from which they derive much of their law." "It is the duty of Historical Jurisprudence not merely to point out the contribution which each nation and race has made to the common product, but also to show how and why the law of one nation has been adopted by another." The book is divided into Part I., Foundations of law; Part II., The development of Jurisprudence; Part III., Beginnings of modern Jurisprudence. This division conforms entirely to Dr. Lee's purpose as expressed in the Introduction. Let us see how well the execution suits the plan.

Part I. deals with the laws of several ancient states : Babylon, Egypt, Phœnicia, Israel, India and Greece. In each case after a few words about the history of the country, there is a summary of portions of its law, and in one or two cases a brief statement of the influence of the law upon other systems. The discussion of the law is too short to do more than indicate the nature of the system. To put the whole law of India into thirty pages, for instance, is like drawing a completed landscape in thirty lines. All the fine discriminations, all the peculiar conceptions, all the individual atmosphere, in short, is lacking ; and it is this peculiar atmosphere of the law which for the purpose of comparative study is of most importance. The few pages which Dr. Lee devotes to a discussion of the influence of these systems upon more modern systems of law form the most suggestive and valuable portion of this part of the book. In a few pages we are told that the Babylonian law passed to the Phœnicians, and although we are warned that we have "No direct knowledge of Phœnician law" we are informed that through the Phœnicians the Babylonian law was carried to Greece and to Rome. The dogmatic method of Dr. Lee's discussion and the lack of constant reference to authorities detract from the value of these suggestions ; but such as they are, they seem to constitute the sole reason for being of Part I.

"The Development of Jurisprudence" is almost entirely devoted to a very good discussion of the history of the Roman law. In this portion of his work Dr. Lee appears to have combined the results of the best modern scholarship with his own study and thought. He states clearly, and with sufficient fullness for his purpose, the beginnings, the development, and the content of Roman law and its final codification in the *Corpus Juris*. This is followed by a brief but luminous description of the origin and growth of the canon law and a quite inadequate one of the barbarian codes.

"The Beginnings of modern Jurisprudence" is less satisfactory because it is more fragmentary. Dr. Lee has here traced the renewal of interest in the Roman law from the thirteenth century, and its reception in the modern European states. Here, if anywhere, was his opportunity to fulfill the promises of his preface. The Roman law, gradually permeating the Gothic jurisprudence of Spain, has been carried into the western and the eastern world ; the Roman-Dutch law, planted in the colonies of the Netherlands, absorbed into the English empire, has reacted strongly on English law and colonial institutions ; and in our own time Egypt and Japan attest the debt of the modern world to Papinian. Dr. Lee, however, passes all this by and instead of it gives a rather full sketch of the reception of the Roman law into Germany and France. The last chapter in the book is devoted to a history of English law to the time of Bracton ; the ground, in fact, covered by Pollock and Maitland. In forty pages Dr. Lee cannot hope to do much with a subject illuminated by the two large volumes of these authorities ; but, as was to be expected from him, he has given an enlightened, though brief, statement of the main points in the early history of English law.

Such is the scope of Dr. Lee's book, and it must be apparent that in it he has not borne out the promise of his preface. The bulk of the volume is legal history, pure and simple, and much the greater part, history of Roman law. Of Historical Jurisprudence (if such a thing exists) we find little outside the Introduction. We do find a useful elementary history of most of the systems of law that can interest us, presented clearly and judiciously.

JOSEPH H. BEALE, JR.

The History of Colonization, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. By HENRY C. MORRIS. (New York and London: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Two vols., pp. xxiv, 459; xiii, 383.)

THIS book, the author says, owes its origin to "a natural interest in the affairs of the day." The recent war with Spain, leading to the acquisition of distant dependencies by the United States, interested Mr. Morris in colonial problems, and he sought in the history of colonization answers to the questions that the present position of our country stimulates. He found that many books had been written on colonies, but that "almost all are devoted to certain special phases, epochs, or fields of research, are written from the standpoint of some one nation, or are too technical to be available and interesting to the majority of readers." To fill the want implied, of a treatise on colonization covering the whole field and suited to the comprehension of the general public, this book was prepared. The introduction promises to the reader a discussion of the different types of colonies and of the conditions necessary to their success, and an exposition of the facts of their history that will show how the principles of colonial policy have been developed.

The task that Mr. Morris sets before himself is a difficult one. Most books on colonization confine themselves to some part of the field simply because colonies have differed so much in different periods, or under different conditions in the same period, that they do not lend themselves to the generalizations of the philosophic historian, and resist inclusion in a single book. A writer who would give us what Mr. Morris promises must be not only conversant with a very broad range of facts, but also endowed with a critical and constructive ability enabling him to use the facts with the utmost efficiency. Extensive reading and thorough training are the two requisites. The author of this book cannot be credited with a satisfactory measure of either.

In the preliminary chapter, on general principles, Mr. Morris shows such confusion of ideas as to destroy at once any hope that he can advance our knowledge of the theory of colonization. The reader is forced to doubt whether the author understands what has already been written on the subject, and whether he is competent even to compile the results of others' investigations. In a book of this kind the matter of classification is of primary importance, if we are to learn anything of the principles of colonization. But even in proposing a scheme of classification,

apart from any practical application of it, the author breaks down. He adopts Roscher's fourfold classification of colonies, but spoils its meaning by making the mode of acquisition, not the prevailing occupation, the distinguishing characteristic. Thus Roscher's *Eroberungskolonien* appear in his first class as "those created or acquired by military force." Such a class includes several kinds of colonies which need to be kept distinct, and does not distinguish the peculiar and interesting type for which Roscher designed it, the type in which the settlers gain a return not from economic production but from political ascendancy. The author does not, however, make a fruitful use of this or any other classification; he applies one or another without discrimination when he applies one at all.

Mr. Morris accepts anything that has been written on colonization, and finds a place for it somewhere. Statements that meant something in their original context become meaningless or inconsistent when they appear in the setting which he gives them. On page 11 we are told, in reference to the relation of mother country and dependency, that an agricultural colony "occasions little cash outlay; returns in general large profits. . . . These facts are well established by the evidence of history." On page 26 we are cautioned to remember our Leroy-Beaulieu, "It must never be forgotten, 'It is exceedingly rare that a colony furnishes a net profit to the mother country; in infancy it cannot, in maturity it will not.'"

When one general statement is not contradicted by another it is generally disproved by facts given in the body of the book. Of the many examples of weak generalization that could be cited I select only one, the statement that throughout history "the colony the most distant from the mother country and the most unlike in climatic and agricultural conditions has always proved the most successful, prosperous and remunerative" (I. 22).

A study of the preliminary chapter will convince any reader who is at all conversant with the subject of colonization that he cannot expect to find the book of value except for the bare facts that it comprises. His interest then will lie in knowing the sources from which the facts are drawn; if he is denied original arrangement of the material and conclusions from it, he will hope that at least the facts are sound, and that the book will guide him to the best sources of information.

At first view one is impressed by the wealth of footnotes and by the bibliography, which covers more than thirty pages of fine print. But the longer one studies these the more disappointed does one become. A large part of the bibliography is simple padding. Colonization is a broad subject, but not so broad as universal history, and the bibliography covers pretty nearly that. Even though sections of it are distinguished as containing books not specifically devoted to colonization but "general works which are useful" there seems no excuse for including in these sections books like Caesar's *Commentaries* or Froissart's *Chronicles*. We are gravely warned that Ingulph of Croyland (that distinguished authority on colonization!) is now regarded as spurious. And the books which really have some bearing on colonization seem to have been sub-

mitted to no critical examination ; old and new, good and bad, are lumped together. There are some serious omissions in the bibliography, but many good books do appear there, and it is only to be regretted that these do not take a more prominent place in the body of the book.

The foot-notes which indicate (not always correctly), the authorities for statements in the text, betray an astonishing lack of critical perception on the part of the author. Apparently all books are to him equally trustworthy. A favorite authority for facts in any period of history is Cantù, *Storia Universale*, Turin, 1857, a compilation which was not considered reliable at the time when it was written, though the standard for such books was much lower than it is to-day. Even old Rollin figures among the authorities in the notes, though his name is decently omitted from the bibliography to make place for the more imposing Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Ammianus Marcellinus. For conditions in ancient Greece we are referred to *The Wealth of Nations*, for the causes of the decline of the Dutch East India Company to Miss Scidmore's *Java*; these are both of them excellent books, but they are hardly satisfactory for the purpose in hand. Good books are cited in the notes, but much oftener apparently than they were used by the author. Thus the name of Heyd's *Geschichte des Levantehandels*, the great secondary authority for Italian settlements in the East, appears not infrequently in the section devoted to medieval colonization, but little use is made of the valuable material in the book, and the author quotes about as much of it indirectly from Adams's *Civilization* as he does from the original.

There seems no need to discuss the contents of the book in detail, or to point out its errors in fact. The first part of Volume I., devoted to colonization in antiquity and in the Middle Ages, is especially poor. The modern period is better treated and as the history approaches the present day it constantly improves. In writing the history of recent events Mr. Morris shows a command of facts and a sense of proportion which are missing in the greater part of his work. It is a pity that he dissipated his energies over so broad a field.

The book will probably be well received by the public; for its subject is popular now and in general its style is agreeable, but it can make no claim to the attention of the student or the scholar.

CLIVE DAY.

Sesostris. Von KURT SETHE. ["Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Alterthumskunde Aegyptens," II. 1.] (Leipzig : Hinrichs. 1900. Pp. 24.)

OF all the puppets which have been made to dance upon the stage of Egyptian history in response to Greek imagination, the most remarkable is that of Sesostris. The readers of this journal are too familiar with the fabulous achievements attributed to him by Herodotus, Diodorus, and all the rest, to require even a reference to them here. The question of

who and what was the real hero who inspired this gradual accumulation of traditions, dilating at last into the dominant figure of Egyptian, if not indeed of all ancient Oriental history, has always been of the greatest interest. How fascinating would be the Alexander romance if we did not know to whom it refers! The subject has been little touched since the days of Lepsius and De Rouge; with the exception of the careful Meyer all the later histories follow Champollion and Lepsius, who, on the flimsiest evidence, identified Sesostri with Ramses II. We all remember when in 1881 the world was startled by the announcement that the mummy of *Sesostri* had been discovered and lay in state at Cairo. His face and figure have since become more familiar to the layman than those of any other Pharaoh.

Professor Sethe has exhaustively examined in the above essay all the classical references to Sesostri and shows clearly that his identification with Ramses II. is entirely gratuitous, for neither: (1) his name, (2) his date, nor (3) his achievements suggest, much less permit such identification. On the other hand Sethe shows, on the basis of name, date and achievements, that, as Manetho has already indicated, Sesostri was Usertesen I. of the Twelfth Dynasty, a king some 700 years older than Ramses II. of the Nineteenth Dynasty. The writer well remembers the day in the Berlin Museum, when Sethe came in all aglow with the enthusiasm of discovery. He had been studying the coffin of a certain "Sebek-sen;" this man's name is composed of two parts; "Sebek" the name of a crocodile god, and "sen" meaning "likeness." The Egyptians in their exaggerated reverence for their divinities always wrote the god's name first in such a compound as the above, although they pronounced it last, thus: "Sen-Sebek" meaning "likeness of Sebek." It had flashed upon Sethe that "*Usertesen*" was another such inversion and that the final "*sen*" should be read first, thus: "*Sen-Usret*" or properly vocalized "*Sen-Wosret*" (in hieroglyphics *Sn-wsrt*).¹ Any one who knows how far removed from the hieroglyphic are the forms of Egyptian proper names transmitted to us by the Greeks, will immediately see that Sesostri is a very natural corruption of Senwosret, and vastly nearer the hieroglyphic than the name of Ramses II. (*Wsr-m't-R'*), long ago accepted without difficulty by the historians. With this observation of Sethe's, the mighty Sesostri of the Greeks suddenly becomes more than legend, and takes a place in authentic history. The question of *name* is thus reduced to the following equations:

1. In Manetho: the old Usertesen I. = Sesostri.
2. On monuments: the old " " = Senwosret I.
3. Therefore Manetho's "Sesostri" = monumental "Senwosret I."

In *date* Sethe shows that practically all the classic sources place Sesostri far earlier than Ramses II., and in most cases at a time well suiting Senwosret I.

The question of career and achievements is too large to be treated here, but one further point it is essential to note. In harmony with the

¹ This had not been noticed before because Wosret is not a well-known deity.

Greek traditions of Sesostris, Senwosret I. is shown by the monuments to have been the first Egyptian conqueror of Nubia. Sethe (p. 17) places the southern limit of his conquest at Wadi Halfa, just below the second cataract, his triumphal tablet¹ having been found at that place. But it was at least 40 miles further south than this, for the list of conquered districts on the above tablet contains the name Sha't (Š'ṯ). Now Sha't is mentioned some 500 years later by Thutmose (Thotmes) III. on the walls of his temple at Kummeh (40 miles above Wadi Halfa) as the place where the stone for this temple was obtained. Hence Sha't is in the vicinity of this temple, and of course above it on the river.² As Kummeh on the east shore, and its pendant fort on the west shore, formed the extreme southern frontier of Nubia afterward, permanently maintained by Senwosret I.'s family (the Twelfth Dynasty), the interesting fact appears that he himself conquered to the extreme limit all the territory afterward held by his dynasty. This fact is quite sufficient to account for the initial fame of his achievements, which ultimately made him the hero of tradition, absorbing not merely the reputations of the other Senwosrets of his dynasty, but also much of the glory of the Asiatic conquests which culminated 500 years later.

Sethe's results therefore add not a little lustre to the name of Senwosret I., the conqueror of Nubia, nearly 2000 B. C., and lend new dignity to the great Twelfth Dynasty. He is also to be congratulated on a brilliant and solid contribution to the study of Greek sources, and he has incidentally again illustrated how nearly useless for early Egyptian history such sources are, unless controlled by contemporary monuments.

JAMES HENRY BREASTED.

The Apostolic Age: Its Life, Doctrine, Worship and Polity. By JAMES VERNON BARTLET, M.A., Mansfield College, Oxford. [Ten Epochs of Church History.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1899. Pp. xlv, 542.)

HISTORIES of the Apostolic Age of the Christian Church vary somewhat painfully with the country in which they are written. Weizsäcker in Germany, McGiffert in America, Bartlet in England present diverse pictures according to their measure of scientific spirit and their critical judgments as to the date and value of the sources. The comfort which perplexed students have felt in the growing consensus of German critics respecting the chronology of early Christian documents will be disturbed by this work of Professor Bartlet, whose canon of apostolicity is more confident even than that of the early Church, and whose chronological distribution of the documents is sadly at variance with modern German and

¹ The writer is about to publish the first complete copy of this tablet in the next number of the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, London. ("The Wadi Halfa Stela of Senwosret I.")

² The second cataract extends below the temple, hence the Sha't quarries must have been *above* the temple, for it is impossible to drag stone boats *up* the cataract.

American tendencies. The preface makes a good impression: "This is the crucial question for every student of the Apostolic Age: 'What think you of Acts—is it genuine history or has idealism largely come between its author and the reality?'" Ramsay's glorification of Luke as "among the historians of the first rank" is then contrasted with McGiffert's opinion that the author of Acts is inaccurate because of prepossessions of his own time. Bartlet promises to "let his decision between the two views work itself out gradually through discussion of each point on its own merits." The general reader will perhaps make from this the mistaken inference that the characteristic result of severe historical criticism is represented by McGiffert. Dr. Cone's careful work seems to be unknown and Weizsäcker's classic treatise, which in its comparison of Acts and the Pauline epistles is a masterly instance of historical method, is all but ignored. Ramsay, Hort and Sanday have had the chief influence on the work. In the discussion of each point as it emerges we have a modified exhibition of Ramsay's treatment of Acts, the result of which is the obscuration of the real Paul and a failure to grasp the issues. A passive reader will hardly discover what the problems of this period are. Whoever tamely accepts with Bartlet the account in Acts xvi: 3, which narrates Paul's circumcision of the son of a Jewish mother and a Greek father in order to please the Jews of the neighborhood, should rouse himself by reading the fifth chapter of Galatians, which, according to Bartlet, had only just been written: "Behold I Paul say unto you that if ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect to you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." To reconcile the story in Acts with this is a psychological impossibility and the details of Mr. Bartlet's discussions are vitiated by his inability to grasp such downright antagonisms.

Another defect of the book is that which is so pronounced a characteristic of Ramsay, an *alles wissen wollen*, which, united with an exaggerated valuation of the sources, ends in a habit of extracting large and ingenious references from slight and innocent remarks. We have several allusions to Luke's "subtle, allusive manner." This subtle indirectness, for example, at the close of Acts leaves us "the suggestion that the centre of the heathen world is destined to supersede the capital of Judaea as the centre of the Kingdom of God." By the same ingenuity of inference Paul's residence in Rome, enabling him to gaze forth from the centre of the world of men, is made to explain the more advanced cosmological conception of Christ in Colossians and Ephesians. The determination to know everything has an extreme illustration with the brief words of Acts, xiii: 3.—"They had also John as assistant." This is expanded as follows: "Besides looking after the material side of their arrangements, he probably helped to baptize converts and to teach them as a 'catechist' certain simple facts about Jesus the Christ and some of his notable sayings." Obviously Mr. Bartlet's work might have been briefer. He is somewhat bothered that Luke should repeat without modification the large predic-

tion of Agabus about a famine over the *whole* world, though he is calm over the general early predictions of a speedy end of all things. The concern shown is like that of the German rationalists who amended the hymn, "*es schläft die ganze Welt*," by the more accurate substitution of "*die halbe*."

In the second part of the work we have a careful and interesting exposition which depends for its truth upon the author's more than doubtful critical views. The Epistle of James is from 44-49 A. D. and therefore one of the earliest of Christian compositions. Its silence about Jesus is due to the fact that it is addressed in part to non-believing Jews. This quiet moralistic discourse surprisingly suggests to Mr. Bartlet the tone of Francis of Assisi and Savonarola. The Epistle to the Hebrews, probably written by Apollos in 62 A. D., is addressed to Christian Jews in Caesarea, and we are furnished with an imaginative description of the reading of the Epistle to the church meeting in Caesarea and of the effect produced. This reads somewhat strangely after Zahn's powerful argument—reinforced by Harnack—that the Epistle was written to a *Hausgemeinde* in Rome. II. Peter, genuine in part, is prior to I. Peter, and the latter, written 62-63, after Paul's death, uses Paul's phraseology in order to show how thoroughly Peter was one with Paul in thought. The Apocalypse is by the Apostle John, 75-80 A. D., and a period of fifteen more years is thought to have intellectually and theologically transformed the Apostle so that he could write the Fourth Gospel and completely abandon his eschatology. The *Didache* is brought into the account as a growth in three stages between 50 and 80 A. D. Use also is made of the Epistle of Barnabas (70-75 A. D.) as well as of Jude (70-80 A. D.) who writes not against Gnostics but Nicolaitan antinomians. These opinions will indicate sufficiently the resultant construction of the Apostolic Age, a construction which does not by consistency and plausibility lend aid to the judgments on which it is based.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

Christianity in the Apostolic Age. By GEORGE T. PURVES, D.D., LL.D., recently Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary. [Historical Series for Bible Students, Vol. VIII.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. xx, 343.)

WHILE it is true that critical scholarship has outgrown most of those extravagances that marked its first stages, and has become, relatively speaking, conservative, all recent volumes of any importance upon the Apostolic Age,—unless we may accept the work of Zahn,—have shown great caution and discrimination in the use of the book of Acts as an historical source, and have shown a tendency to recognize several of the epistles of the New Testament as either reworkings of apostolic materials or as pseudonymous. It would seem, therefore, impossible for an historian of the period to avoid the serious discussion, or at least to escape

the influence of a generation of criticism. It would probably be incorrect to say that Dr. Purves has proved an exception to such an expectation, but his work gives but few evidences of critical influence. In accordance with the admirable plan of the series to which his volume belongs, he has considered briefly the sources upon which his work rests; but in no case has he surrendered an element of the traditional view as regards the authorship of the New Testament writings, even as regards II. Peter. And although he occasionally passes lightly over the supernatural occurrences in the opening chapters of Acts, he unquestioningly accepts the book as a piece of historical work of the first order. Even when theological matters are not at issue, Dr. Purves shows unwillingness to concede anything of importance to recent scholarship. Thus as regards the location of the Galatian churches, a matter of late so ably re-argued by Ramsay, he holds steadily to the view of Lightfoot. It is therefore easy to understand why he should reject the two-source hypothesis as to the origin of the synoptic gospels, upon which New Testament scholars are so generally agreed, and prefer the hypothesis of Westcott and others of an oral gospel used by the three evangelists.

But if the book is open to serious objections from the point of view of the critical historian, it is hardly more acceptable to the historical theologian. Dr. Purves's position forbids his handling the difficult but fundamental questions as to the relation of Pauline and early Christian thought concerning the Second Coming of Christ with current Judaism, or that of other elements with current Graeco-Roman philosophy. In its exposition of the Pauline theology, however, the book is not without value. Dr. Purves is a trained exegete, to whom Paulinism is by no means a closed volume. While, therefore, the scope of the series does not permit any large treatment of biblical-theological subjects, in so far as it is devoted to direct exposition, it is welcome. Naturally, however, we should not expect in it any marked recognition of other than canonical writings as co-ordinate sources of early Christian teaching.

Altogether, therefore, we must say the volume is what its author probably intended to make it,—a well-balanced presentation of the history of the apostolic age from the point of view of those who, while using the methods of current criticism, reject such of its results as do not square with a presupposed theological position as regards inspiration.

SHAILER MATTHEWS.

The Sources and Literature of English History from the Earliest Times to about 1485. By CHARLES GROSS. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1900. Pp. xx, 618.)

No scholar can look at this book without an immediate sense of acknowledgment to its author, deepening into real gratitude and appreciation as he examines it further. It is true that he may suppress a sigh when his thoughts turn to a cherished hoard of bibliographical notes and references, painfully gathered through toilsome years; realizing that as far

as present value goes, he might have saved his labor, for here is all his private bibliographical lore in print for the public. If he is a teacher, a dubious remembrance may rise in his mind that a certain course of bibliographical lectures will have to be rewritten, now that so much of its contents is in a shape to which his students can be referred once for all. He may guess that the pleasant sense of indispensableness to a group of colleagues and students from being the sole source of information about a little special field is a sensation to be experienced no more, now that Dr. Gross is at everybody's service. But after all these are part of the price we pay for progress, familiar in the history of the race as of the individual, and in material as well as intellectual fields. What is really important is that we have at last a full, scholarly, well classified bibliography of English medieval history, quite equal to anything that exists for the continental countries.

Wattenbach's *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, Lorenz's continuation of the same work, and Franklin's *Sources de l'Histoire de France*, which suggest themselves from the similarity of the period they cover in their respective countries, are really not similar works, since they discuss only primary sources, while Dr. Gross's bibliography includes a description of secondary works also. The three works with which it is most distinctly comparable are therefore, Dahlmann-Waitz-Steindorff, *Quellenbuch der deutschen Geschichte*, Monod's *Bibliographie de l'Histoire de France*, and Pirenne's *Bibliographie de l'Histoire de Belgique*.

Dr. Gross's bibliography does not cover as long a period as either of these works, Dahlmann-Waitz in its latest edition coming all the way down to 1890, Monod to 1789, and Pirenne to 1598 for all of the Netherlands, and to 1830 for the Belgian provinces. Correspondingly the English bibliography contains only a few more than 3000 items, while that of Germany contains more than 6500, that of France more than 4500, and even that of the Netherlands, 2084. On the other hand, for the period which his work does cover, Gross includes articles in periodicals and in transactions of societies, not merely independent works, as do the other three books. Again, Gross distributes his titles into a much more detailed classification in groups and subjects, although the general twofold distinction into works which can be grouped under successive chronological periods, and those which are not so grouped are alike in all four works. But the most fundamental and important of all points of comparison is that Dr. Gross gives descriptions, analyses, criticisms or estimates of a large proportion of the books he names, while all the other bibliographies restrict themselves to a mere statement of the title, place and date of publication, editions, size and form. There can be no doubt of the superiority of this method of treatment. A mere list of titles leaves all but the barest fact of publication still to be looked up by the searcher, whereas some further information as to character, contents and relations to other books, and some expert judgment as to merits, often indicates the value or valuelessness of the book for the purposes for which the student wishes the references. In addition there is the innate inter-

est of much of this information about books. It is true that the judgment of the maker of the bibliography will not always be correct, that his estimates will not always be accepted,—and indeed we should be inclined to dispute more than one of Dr. Gross's *dicta*; but such shortcomings or differences of opinion are as nothing compared with the great value given to the entries by this additional information and by the statements, criticisms, and “appreciation,” prefixed to each section.

The work is divided into four parts, the first, including about one quarter of the book, being devoted to “general authorities,” the other three, to the period of origins, the Anglo-Saxon period, and that between 1066 and 1485, respectively. England, Wales and Ireland are dealt with, but Scotland is not, or at least is only included occasionally, as are several other countries, when their affairs are influential on English history. The first part is necessarily somewhat incoherent, involving lists and descriptions of bibliographical works, journals, works on the sciences auxiliary to history, the archives, collections of sources printed by public and private bodies and by individuals, and secondary works on a great variety of historical subjects which do not fall properly in the later chronological treatment. Perhaps the most noticeable feature about this section is its catholicity. The author, as might be expected from his earlier work, does not hesitate to include much institutional, antiquarian, and almost technical matter that frequently receives but scant recognition or attention from the historical student. Particularly is this true of his sections on local history and on commerce, industry, and agriculture. Part II. is necessarily short, though it contains more material of controversy than all the history of England since. In Part III. Dr. Gross's account of contemporary writings and legal collections, with their literature and the varying views held or conclusions reached upon them by modern scholars, takes up much more space than the list of independent works of modern scholars. Indeed, a single item like the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* or *Nennius* is the occasion for a long paragraph of references to editions and translations, for a list of half a dozen or more writers on the subject, and a paragraph summing up conclusions.

A full half of the book remains to Part IV., the period from the Norman Conquest to 1485, and here again much more than half the space, some 225 pages, is required to describe the original sources.

The description of the chronicles and the main bodies of documents, classified under various subdivisions of place and subject, is given with a fullness and continuity quite unknown elsewhere. The wealth of chronicles which we possess for this period, especially for the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, comes out clearly, especially so in the convenient list of contemporary chroniclers by reigns which Dr. Gross has drawn up. And yet the description of the more varied contemporary source-material is vastly more impressive. In official records of Parliament, of the various law-courts, of government offices, in taxation-rolls, city, manorial, episcopal and monastic records, wills, correspondence, poetry, and in still other forms, we have the raw material from which a true knowledge

of the past will eventually be constructed. In such documents, the personal bias of the writer is at a minimum, for he had usually no ulterior motive, no intention of doing anything more than to preserve a record ; ignorance of the facts cannot be charged against the compilers for they describe what passed under their very eyes, or expressed what was in their own thoughts. Above all this kind of records extends into all the minute facts of daily life, all the realities of the normal life of the world of the time, all the personal doings of actual men and women. It is doubtful whether any one has ever realized the immense mass of this contemporary material for the history of civilization in England in the mediæval centuries, until it has been thus listed and described. For instance, of one kind of documents, those concerning the Church, in one class, the bishops' registers, there are some thirteen from nine different dioceses here recorded as being in print. The whole history of the Church has been surrounded with such a mist of ancient and modern polemics that if one turns to the reading of these plain records of the every-day routine, the normal, strenuous and mostly beneficent work of a mediæval bishop, it is like breathing a new and fresher air.

Similarly town and gild records, church-wardens' accounts, household books and others which even the author after all his fullness of classification is obliged to group as "miscellaneous," exist in numbers that few special students even have known of, except indeed as in this particular class they were already indicated in Dr. Gross's earlier bibliography. It is in the extraction of titles of such works from the *Transactions* of local societies in which they have been buried, their discovery among the issues from obscure provincial publishing houses, and the brief indications of their contents, that some of the most original, most laborious and most useful of Dr. Gross's work has been done.

Some four hundred secondary works on the history of the period from 1066 to 1485, is a much shorter list than that of works in German and French history during the same period, even including articles in journals. A series of appendices analyzing the *Reports* of the Historical Manuscripts Commission and the *Rolls Series*, and regrouping the principal narrative, official, and legal sources in a chronological list, and an admirable index, completes the tale of acknowledgment of our various items of indebtedness to the author of this bibliography.

Omissions will no doubt show themselves, though our search has so far not disclosed them except in cases where there was a sufficient reason ; differences of judgment of course exist ; some criticism might perhaps be made of the principle of subdivision of subjects ; but the one sentiment among students of English history will be one of grateful appreciation for this work, and of earnest hopefulness that an equally good scholar will some time perform the same service for the modern history of England.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

Collection de Documents pour l'Histoire Religieuse et Littéraire du Moyen Age :

Tome I. *Speculum Perfectionis, seu Sancti Francisci Assisiensis Legenda Antiquissima*. Nunc primum integre edidit PAUL SABATIER. (Paris : Fischbacher. 1898. Pp. ccxiv, 376.)

Tome II. *Fratris Francisci Bartholi de Assisio Tractatus de Indulgentia S. Mariae de Portiuncula*. Nunc primum integre edidit PAUL SABATIER. (Paris : Fischbacher. 1900. Pp. clxxxiv, 204.)

IN the first of these volumes, Sabatier prints a document which he argues is not only the oldest biography of Francis of Assisi, but also the one in which the character of the saint is portrayed most vigorously and poetically. He maintains that it was written by Brother Leo, less than a year after the death of St. Francis, and was finished May 11, 1227, at Portiuncula. He is especially interested in it because it is almost identical with the document which he reconstructed by internal criticism from the *Speculum Vitae* of 1509 and which he used as one of the sources for his *Life of St. Francis*. The document, as he reconstructed it by internal evidence, contained 118 chapters. Of these, 116 are in the actual *Speculum Perfectionis*, which contains in addition 8 more. Sabatier may well be pleased with such a proof of the soundness of his method in internal criticism. It is too early as yet to pronounce a judgment upon his claims as to the date, authenticity and authorship. His arguments have been controverted by some of the ablest specialists, and as yet there is no unanimity of opinion.

In the second volume, in addition to the treatise of Bartholus, Sabatier prints the more ancient sources for the history of the famous indulgence of the Portiuncula. In the *Life of St. Francis*, Sabatier wrote : "With the patience of four Benedictines (of the best days) we should doubtless be able to find our way in the medley of documents, more or less corrupted, from which it comes to us, and little by little we might find the starting-point of this dream in a friar who sees blinded humanity kneeling around Portiuncula to recover sight." This is a task that he has undertaken. In his laborious and loving study he has been led to change his opinion as to the origin of the indulgence. When he wrote the *Life*, he believed that the indulgence had "no direct connection with the history of St. Francis." On p. 444 of the English translation his opinion was stated even more positively. "Did Francis ask this indulgence and did Honorius III. grant it? Merely to reduce it to these simple proportions is to be brought to answer it with a categorical No."

The study of the earliest documents has led him to change this opinion, and in his zeal for truth he does not hesitate to confess what he believes to have been his error. A brief summary cannot do justice to his point of view, and can merely indicate the chief outlines of his

discussion. He controverts the argument of the "improbability in representing Francis, a declared opponent of privileges and the chief of an order just founded, as imploring from the Holy See an exorbitant favor," by the argument that "this indulgence is not a privilege, it is an act of love on the part of the sovereign pontiff for the members of the church. Neither the Chapel of the Portiuncula nor the Minorites were to receive the slightest profit from it." The argument from the silence, with regard to the indulgence, observed by the earliest biographers of St. Francis he thinks is no longer tenable. The *Legend of the Three Companions* published by Marcellino da Civezza and Teofilo Domenichelli is, as they argue, one of the earliest and most authentic sources, and this document is explicit on the subject of the indulgence. As the authenticity of this biography is questioned, Sabatier does not care to press this point, but turns to the consideration of the traditional biographies. He argues that the various authors have copied from one another, and that we have, properly speaking, only two biographies: one by Tommaso da Celano, the other by the Three Companions. The latter cannot be said to have made no mention of the indulgence, because we do not possess their work in its primitive form. The portions which have been lost may have contained a full statement as to the origin of this indulgence. Tommaso da Celano would not have been permitted by Gregory IX. to speak of the indulgence, as this pope regarded it "as indiscreet and dangerous." But the silence of the earlier biographies is "more apparent than real." "Without the indulgence, the chapters which they all consecrate to chanting the glories of the little sanctuary of Portiuncula appear . . . inexplicable." This is merely a bald summary of his arguments, stated as far as possible in his own words, but very greatly abridged.

To the present reviewer they seem far from conclusive. In fact, Sabatier does not seem wholly ingenuous in neglecting what is (as has been pointed out by Mr. Lea in his *History of Confession and Indulgences*, III. 238) the strongest argument against the genuineness of the legend. "Tommaso da Celano expressly tells us that no layman was allowed to enter it [the church of the Portiuncula], and this injunction is crystallized in the legend that when Piero da Catania, whom St. Francis had put at the head of the Order, died and was buried in the Portiuncula, and, coruscating in miracles, brought multitudes of worshippers to it, Francis, on returning to Assisi, went to his tomb and addressed him: 'Brother Peter, in life you were always obedient to me; as, through your miracles, we are pestered by laymen, you must obey me in death. I therefore order you on your obedience to cease from the miracles through which we are troubled by laymen.' " Other arguments which Sabatier has not answered are set forth in Mr. Lea's work, as well as elsewhere.

In conclusion it is hardly necessary to say that both of these volumes are models, in most respects, of critical scholarship. We owe a great debt of gratitude to Sabatier for the information which he has made ac-

cessible about the early history of the Franciscan Order and its chief members, for the scholarly editions of new texts, and for the indefatigable zeal with which he has labored on even the most minute points.

Histoire de la Marine Française. Vol. II. *La Guerre de Cent Ans; Révolution Maritime.* Par CHARLES DE LA RONCIÈRE. (Paris: Plon, Nourit and Co. 1900. Pp. 560.)

M. DE LA RONCIÈRE's new volume is devoted mainly to the Hundred Years' War, but with regret it must be said at once that one rises from the perusal of it with little more knowledge of the effect of naval action upon the course of that long struggle than one had when one began. Facts it is true are lavished upon us with a profusion that tells of infinite labor and an unsurpassed enthusiasm for research. But facts and research alone will not make a naval history. Rather for the bulk of readers do they tend by themselves to deepen the obscurity that hangs round an obscure subject. Without some sustained attempt to correlate the apparently disconnected events, to deduce from them some kind of principles, to explain their bearing on the development of naval science, and their general place in the broad progression of the war, such a work sinks to the position of a chronicle. It cannot be called a history. Yet M. de la Roncière almost chokes his subject with ill-digested facts. He spares us nothing, no matter how minute and how little germane to the matter in hand. He can scarcely draw breath for a moment to help us get our bearings, and even when he does his exposition is sometimes far from luminous and not always sound. Nor has he the excuse that his main purpose is to rescue from oblivion the exploits of the French marine. For the greater part of his story is not concerned with the French marine at all, but is devoted to the exploits of Spanish, Italian, and other squadrons hired by the French government or with which French officers or French ships were serving. Not that such matters should not find a place in a history of the French navy, for therein lies its universal interest and importance. As M. de la Roncière himself has so ably pointed out, France throughout the Middle Ages was the focus of the naval art. Every existing influence was brought directly to bear upon its navy and left its mark. To explain the French navy all these influences must be followed and understood. A real history of the French navy would be also a real history of the art of war by sea. Around no other marine could the work be so artistically and logically arranged. But of this broad fact, which in his first volume M. de la Roncière seemed about to handle with so much skill, his grip grows looser as he proceeds and we feel with genuine disappointment that a great opportunity is being missed.

Nor can our reluctant fault-finding stop here. For so far from carrying further our knowledge of the strategy, tactics and material of medieval navies, he leaves it behind the point it has already reached, and even tends to cover up what other workers to some extent have laid bare. The antiquary's lack of interest in the living professional aspect of the

subject is no doubt in some measure to blame. Indeed M. de la Roncière has so far neglected to equip himself for this part of his task, that throughout the work he makes no distinction between strategy and tactics and frequently uses the one word for the other. The fault is also partly due to a certain want of precision in his work. The richest and most illuminating authority on medieval naval warfare is the *Victorial* of Diaz de Gomez, and M. de la Roncière rightly devotes a chapter to it. Yet the inadequacy of his method will be apparent if we consider how he deals with the passage describing the formation of the English fleet in the action off Ambleteuse. The passage as quoted in a note is as follows:—"Ficieron una as á los balleneros mayores é pusieron á los espaldas dos naos grandes é una coca de Alemania é los balleneros pequenos pusieron en medio." On this foundation M. de la Roncière writes thus:—"Les Anglais se formaient en bataille suivant l'ordre traditionnel (of which he has nowhere told us anything) en première ligne les grands baleiniers flanqués sur les ailes de deux gros nefes et d'une coque d'Allemagne; les petits bâtiments étaient placés en soutien." Can this by any stretch of courtesy be called an adequate rendering? The Spanish has nothing about two or more "lines" and nothing about "supports." The real crux of the passage is, like the "herse" at Hastings, what did the author mean by "una as." Yet this is passed over without a word, though an explanation is not far to seek and that a very plausible one and one that excludes the assumption of two or more lines. M. de la Roncière's paraphrase of the concluding sentence, which relates how the vessels took up their stations in the calm, is equally open to objection. "Esto facian" says the original "con los bateles, é aun avia algunos balleneros de remos é de vela." Of this he writes "Faute de vent les bateaux et quelques baleiniers mixtes à rames et à voile remorquèrent les voiliers à leur poste de combat." Yet the original does not say the "ballingers" did the towing. The point of the passage, which M. de la Roncière entirely misses, is that some at least of the "ballingers" were to some extent vessels of free movement, and were able to get into position without being towed. These points may seem minute, but when a passage so rare and invaluable, a true *locus classicus* on which turns the whole question of medieval formations and the whole question of free and subservient movement, is found to be so loosely dealt with, the inevitable effect is seriously to prejudice our confidence in the whole work.

When at last M. de la Roncière brings himself to a serious consideration of material, the same want of precision continues. Towards the end of the volume he attempts to deal with the *Révolution Maritime* which he regards as taking place at the end of the fifteenth century; and here disappointment increases to despair. It is as though we were watching a man hunting for curiosities amongst half-completed excavations and in his eagerness to fill his museum recklessly covering up what the painful labor of others has partially revealed. Indeed after all the work that has been done in his own and other countries there is really no excuse for such a chapter, for instance, as that entitled "Les Vaisseaux." Far

better to have left the subject alone than to have dealt with it so. Take for example the difficult case of the galleon, around the development of which hangs the whole history of the genesis of sailing tactics. In the century or so with which he is dealing the galleon grew from being a modified galley or *mezzo-galera* into the ship of the line. It is hardly too much to say that in form, armament and tactical value galleons of 1475 could differ as much from galleons of 1575 as the steam frigates of the fifties differed from the cruisers of to-day. Yet in the single page which he deems the subject merits he deals vaguely with the galleon of the time and to explain what it was cites at random from authors and examples extending over the whole period as if they were contemporaneous. The same must regretfully be said of his chapter on "L'Artillerie de la Marine." Here again in the period under treatment naval ordnance developed from a crude and impotent infancy up to nearly what it continued to be in Nelson's time, and yet to explain any given nature of gun M. de la Roncière can quote with perfect indifference from authorities extending from the end of the fifteenth century far into the seventeenth. For such work the world is too old and France has given us the right to expect something better from one of her most distinguished scholars.

Still it is pleasant to be able to say that if the defects of the work seem glaring it is partly due to the real excellence of the bulk of it. They become conspicuous by contrast with the ungrudging and persistent labor the writer continues to disclose, the wide range he covers, and the mass of unsuspected sources of information he opens out. For the student of naval history, no matter what his nationality, the book must remain indispensable, a well from which he may draw inexhaustibly, a gazetteer which will seldom fail to direct his steps. Nor can it ever be denied a high place as having rescued from oblivion a teeming mass of history, and as affording a solid contribution to knowledge in a field that has been unaccountably neglected. As special examples of the value of the work may be mentioned the section on Jean de Vienne, on the attempted invasion of England in 1386, on Jacques Cœur, on the maritime policy of Louis XI. with the exploits of Coulon, and on the constitution and jurisdictions of the Four Admiralties; while for those who would study such widely different subjects as for instance the early attempts of France at maritime domination in the Mediterranean and the influence of the sea power on the Wars of the Roses material will be found in equal abundance.

JULIAN S. CORBETT.

The Council of Constance to the Death of John Hus. Being the Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in Lent Term, 1900. By JAMES HAMILTON WYLIE, M.A. (London: Longmans. 1900. Pp. 192.)

If there was one man of English speech from whom we had a right to hope for a fresh readable book on the Council of Constance, it was Mr. James Hamilton Wylie. For a quarter-century he has been engaged

on that close study of the early fifteenth century which has fruited in the successive volumes of his *History of England under Henry the Fourth*; and the breadth of view which saw England's history in every larger interest she shared with Christendom; giving us luminous chapters on Timur the Tartar and on the wars in Pruce, led him, above all, to trace the fortunes of the Latin Church. Nowhere perhaps in English have we so vivid portrayal as in his pages of the confusion wrought by the Great Schism, of the futile efforts at union, of the Pisan Council, of the ferment at Prague. But just here, in 1413, on the very threshold of the great gathering at Constance, the death of Henry brought his pen to a pause. It was a happy inspiration, born of a like breadth of view, which moved those who choose for Oxford a Ford lecturer on English history to win from him this supplement. The six lectures deal respectively with "Sigismund," the council's author; with "Constance," its scene; with the make-up and the beginning of "The Council" itself; with the "Deposition" of Pope John; with "John Hus"—his "Trial" and his "Death." To these, as a "Preliminary," the lecturer now adds a chatty enumeration of his sources, and at their close, as "L'Envoi," a word to the critics who have accused him of over-minuteness and of a want of literary style.

If Mr. Wylie's pages have no style, so much the worse for style. They have what is better—charm. Unlike enough is his gossipy, galloping story, reeking with the very smell and savor of the time it tells of, to the stately chapters in which the lamented Bishop Creighton has given us our other notable English account of the great Council; and those who wish all their history after a single model will hardly approve Mr. Wylie's. But to those who love individuality for its own sake, and especially if they like their history in the concrete, what was ever more companionable? Minute Mr. Wylie is; but all his details are significant. It is his sources which speak; and to every phrase and epithet of these new pages, despite their lack of learned *Apparat*, there has gone the same wealth of research which burdened with foot-notes his old. And while his fondness for archaisms, which gave such umbrage to the critics of his *Henry IV.*, here betrays itself only occasionally in quaint word or turn of phrase, the racy, devil-may-care Saxon of even his loosest paragraphs makes the English heart within one bound with glee.

Yet the history of the Council is but half told. By July of 1415, where he breaks off, schism was scotched and heresy singed; but reform was yet to grapple with. May he give us soon the rest of the story—whether as lectures like these or as chapters of an *England under Henry V.*

GEORGE LINCOLN BURR.

The Reformation. By WILLISTON WALKER. [Ten Epochs of Church History.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. x, 478.)

IN attempting to give in four hundred pages a sketch of the Reformation movement from its beginnings in the fourteenth century to the close

of the Thirty Years' War, Professor Walker has not concealed from himself nor from his readers the difficulty of the task. He has wisely restricted himself to the continent of Europe, but, even with this limitation, he has been able only to indicate the salient points in the great transition. In his selection of names and incidents to be treated in some detail he has generally been happy, and the sense of proportion is nowhere offended. In his judgment of leading persons he has not sought to be original in any sense, but follows the best judgment of recent and careful scholarship. The entire absence of all reference to authority leaves one sometimes at a loss to trace his sources, but in the main it is evident that he has not written without a proper use of special studies on many controverted points.

While no one could be in doubt as to the author's Protestantism, his fairness in describing Roman Catholic institutions, as far as possible, from their positive side is most praiseworthy. There is a refreshing absence of all partisan abuse, which makes his careful analysis of the real dangers against which the Reformation contended so much the more convincing. The same moderation is evident in the description of sectarian divergences within Protestantism itself. The figure of Calvin finds naturally a central place, but full justice is done to all the widely divergent efforts to bring clearness and power into the vague and shifting forces of the anti-Catholic assault.

Novel to many readers of the conventional Protestant tradition, though not to any student of more recent literature, will be the accounts of pre-Reformation reform movements within the Catholic church itself. Most noteworthy, perhaps, in this direction is the chapter on the "Spanish Awakening." We have hardly become accustomed to the thought, that in Spain, the country of all others in which the principles of the Reformation found their most determined opposition, there was, long before Luther, a vigorous stirring of the religious consciousness against the evils which Luther and his followers tried to remove. Professor Walker brings out these reformatory efforts into the clearest light, but does not fail also to show that they were of necessity insufficient because they did not touch the great central fact of the responsibility of every human soul to its God, without the intervention of any other human authority whatever. So in regard to Italy; the encouraging signs of a spiritual awakening are given their due proportion, and then we are shown how these first efforts were crushed out by the necessities of maintaining the papal establishment, with all its vast consequences for the Italian communities. On the other hand it is made evident that theoretical declarations of freedom and responsibility, such as the doctrinaires of the early fourteenth century and of the conciliar period produced in abundance, were destined to remain futile until they were given concrete expression in the German revolt against priestly tyranny. And again the extravagant demonstrations of the Radical parties from Münzer to Servetus are set in their true light as inevitable outgrowths of the liberal spirit, which it was Luther's first care to hold within the leading-strings of his own conservative instinct.

With so much of clearness and justness in his view of the Reformation, one cannot help feeling a certain regret that the limitations of the series in which his volume appears did not allow Professor Walker to embody his results in a form that would have admitted some more distinctly literary treatment. One feels at every step the formula of a text-book demanding a little something about everything, rather than the spirit of an essay which should interest and hold the attention by its consistent working out of a main theme. The positive qualities of this volume make it rise easily above the general level of the series, but after all it is neither a good text-book nor an interesting book to read. It lacks, almost necessarily, the system of the former and the style appropriate to the latter. Let us wish to Dr. Walker in the inspiration of his new surroundings, the leisure to work out, free of all limitations, such an interpretation of the Reformation period as the literature of the past score of years makes possible and desirable.

Theodore Beza, the Counsellor of the French Reformation (1519-1605). By HENRY MARTYN BAIRD, Professor in New York University. [Heroes of the Reformation.] (G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York and London. 1899. Pps. xxi, 376.)

No one of the volumes of the series which has been planned under the editorship of Professor Jackson, finds so large an empty space waiting for it as this. Of the two best-known lives of Beza, the fragment of Baum was written in 1843 and the complete work of Heppe in 1861. English readers have had no other source of information concerning Beza except such slight sketches of ten or twenty pages as appear in Harbaugh's *Fathers of the Reformed Church* or Hook's *Ecclesiastical Biography*.

No one could be better qualified by knowledge of contemporary related literature than Professor Baird, to write a sketch of the man who succeeded Calvin as intellectual leader of the French Reformation, and was during the last thirty years of his life one of the most conspicuous ecclesiastical personages in Europe. Professor Baird has been faithful to his own ideal expressed in his recent review of Dr. Lindsay's *Martin Luther*, and has given us a volume which "intended for general readers, naturally avoids any display of authorities, although it is evidently built upon a firm foundation of solid scholarship hidden from view."

The title of this series, "Heroes of the Reformation" (a title which Dr. Emerton humorously represents the ghost of his hero, Erasmus, as refusing with dismay), suggests a somewhat eulogistic method of treatment. Dr. Baird, while adopting this tone, is not betrayed into any unconscious suppression or distortion of facts, and he is free by instinct from the partisan special pleading of writers like D'Aubigné and Janssen, which the prospectus of the series promised to avoid. There is a clear cool atmosphere of candor about Chapter IV., "Treatise on the Punishment of Heretics," very refreshing to those who have been wearied by the

heated clamor with which denominational polemics have so often filled the grave and studious apartments of history. The eulogistic tone however occasionally betrays the author into a pleonastic use of adjectives, which does not increase the effectiveness of his strong and dignified style. A conspicuous instance is found on page 141, where the adjective "great" is applied four times in ten lines.

Occasionally also he seems to be betrayed into a slight exaggeration of emphasis by the defensive tone which is natural to one who is so familiar with what most of his readers have no knowledge of, the mass of contemporary calumny showered upon Beza and other heroes of the Reformation. At page 254-262 it might have been pointed out that the abuses of plurality, non-residence, etc., of which Beza complained had existed also under Edward before the "retrograde movement tending to the introduction of theories and practices long since discarded," had begun under Elizabeth. (See Peter Martyr to Bullinger; Bucer to Calvin, both 1550. *Original Letters*, Parker Society.)

On page 279 Dr. Baird tells us: "The Swiss reformers, Bullinger, Beza, and all the others, were shocked, amazed, indignant" at Ochino's view that bigamy was not prohibited by divine law. Unless Dr. Baird uses the word "reformers" in the technical sense rather than in the popular sense of the title of the series, this accumulation of adjectives seems superfluous, because a scholastic admission of the possibility of bigamy was not an absolutely unheard-of opinion. Luther and Melancthon did not consider bigamy a sin *per se*, and in company with several other prominent divines they expressly sanctioned the recent bigamous marriage of Philip of Hesse with the written agreement that he was not to abandon his first wife.

In general the realism of this strong and clear piece of historical portrait painting might perhaps be increased if the high lights were thrown out by a little more shadow. It is now accepted as a principle that the controversial blackguarding which even admirable men in the sixteenth century showered upon their opponents is not to be taken seriously. The latest biographers of Pietro Aretino show good reasons for believing that even that typical blackmailer has, by a sort of poetic justice, suffered because the calumnies of his adversaries have been too unquestioningly accepted. Is it not also probable that students of the sixteenth century ought to discount, at least to some slight extent, the stately and exaggerated compliments of its reigning epistolary and obituary style?

Not only general readers of history but all who are engaged in the task of teaching elementary sixteenth-century history to students who can use fluently no language but English, are indebted to Dr. Baird for accomplishing his task with the success that was to be anticipated from the author of the *Rise of the Huguenots* and its succeeding volumes.

PAUL VAN DYKE.

England under the Protector Somerset. By A. F. POLLARD. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co. 1900. Pp. 362.)

JUST as the policy pursued by King John proved to be extremely favorable to the development of English constitutional liberties, so the influence of Mr. Froude has been useful in bringing about an accurate study and truthful representation of English history during the Tudor period. Mr. Froude's dogmatism, reckless use of authorities, and subjective interpretation of history roused so much opposition in the minds of other students that they were driven to subject all sources of information to a new and closer scrutiny and have reached results very different from his and from those of his predecessors. Mr. Pollard's essay appears to be one of this group of works.

It is true that it is a deliberate effort to rehabilitate the Protector,—to lift him from the somewhat contemptible position in which Mr. Froude had left him, and to relieve him of the load of odium with which certain other writers had burdened him. Yet to say that Mr. Pollard holds a brief for Somerset does not necessarily imply that he has not written a trustworthy account of his life and administration. On the contrary his search for materials has been exhaustive, as witness the admirable bibliographical appendix, and his use of these materials has been sufficiently critical. His picture of the condition of England at the death of Henry VIII. is made extremely sombre in order to bring out the difficulties confronting Somerset, and the policy of the Duke of Northumberland is naturally painted in equally dark colors in the process of describing it as a reaction from the moderation of the Protector's administration. But these are the setting of the work rather than its main subject. This is a careful study of the actions and policy of the Protector from the death of Henry VIII. to his own execution, under the four aspects of his methods of government, his religious changes, his foreign policy, and his opposition to the agrarian changes in progress at the time. Under the first of these heads Mr. Pollard finds the key-note of the Protector's policy a desire to "lift the weight of absolutism which the Tudors had imposed on England," by sweeping away all the treason laws which then heavily encumbered the statute-book, by allowing freedom of speech in Parliament, and by increasing the importance of that body. He was "a believer in constitutional freedom."

In the same way in religious affairs his administration was a period of moderation, and of such change only as was approved by Parliament and Convocation and probably not distasteful to the mass of the people. Most of the religious changes were projects formed and prepared long before but withheld because of the reactionary or at least stationary attitude of Henry during his later years. The prelates who opposed the policy of the government in the debates in Parliament were not punished in any way, and there was not a single execution for any kind of religious opinion. Most of those instances of radical Protestant action and of religious coercion usually cited as characteristic of the reign of Edward

apply to the period after Somerset's fall. Indeed Mr. Pollard's most fundamental criticism of other historians of the period is that they make a habit of treating the reign of Edward VI. as a single whole, and therefore attribute to Somerset much that belonged to the administration of his successor and that was diametrically opposed to his policy and character. As a matter of fact the last four years of the reign of Edward, as contrasted with the first three, were marked by a reaction from "the Protector's experiment in liberty and toleration" to the arbitrary and repressive measures and the reckless unprincipled policy of the Duke of Northumberland.

It is to the Protector's attitude toward the social changes of the time that Mr. Pollard attributes his downfall. The members of the Council were typical "enclosers," and they moreover represented the feelings and interests of the majority in Parliament and of the landowning class in the country generally. Against the agrarian changes which were being carried out in the interests of such men and to the destruction of the lower classes in the country, Somerset and a small party of reformers set themselves, and used all the influence of his position. But the powers against them were too strong and the Protector was deposed. His execution occurred as a necessary step in the rise to unopposed power of his successor. In a vigorous and eloquent closing chapter on the Protector's work and character he is credited with being "one of the few idealists who have attempted to govern England." "His means were inadequate, his time was short, and the men with whom he worked had no eye for the loftiness of his aims, and no sympathy with the motives that impelled him. Yet his achievements were of no mean order. Immediate failure was but the prelude to ultimate success." In the long run the main lines of his policy have been followed and its main objects attained.

If the position which Somerset holds in history is not modified by Mr. Pollard's careful and spirited study, it will not be because a good plea has not been made for him.

E. P. CHEYNEY.

The Successors of Drake. By JULIAN S. CORBETT. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1900. Pp. x, 464.)

THIS attractive volume forms a sequel to the same author's *Drake and the Tudor Navy* and carries the history of the great naval war with the Spanish Empire down to the end of Elizabeth's reign. Like that on Drake the present work is based upon deep and wide study of the literature and of original, in some important cases hitherto nearly or quite unknown, sources of the subject. Into this rich mass of materials the author has breathed the life of incisive independent thought and a crisp, lively, yet distinguished style.

Mr. Corbett thinks the prevalent view of the period as crystallized by Seeley to be "curiously, even perversely inadequate." Seeley says that the war after the defeat of the Armada was "chiefly a series of plundering expeditions in which the Government scarcely aimed at a single

national object," and that "the glory of 1588 tinged every succeeding year of the war: the sense of danger and the tension that had held the national mind for a whole generation was gone, and a new generation grew up to revel in victory and discovery." Mr. Corbett's researches on the other hand have led him to see in the same period "the birth of the Spanish navy," such "well-matured attempts as the campaigns of 1596 and 1597," a "new Armada off Ushant," Spinola at Sluys, and "Spanish naval stations established from end to end of the Channel," the invasion of Ireland and the "English cruising squadrons again and again driven off their ground by superior force." And even in the case of the expedition to Cadiz, the only naval event of Elizabeth's last decade ever dealt with in detail, Mr. Corbett disputes the dictum of "our first authority in naval history" that it was the Trafalgar of the Elizabethan war. To be sure, he says, it was the last naval victory, but "so far from being a crowning success it was rather an irretrievable miscarriage, that condemned the war to an inefficient conclusion."

So much for Mr. Corbett's general interpretation of the period. Historical investigation is, however, not his only object: he deliberately uses the events he relates to illustrate and inculcate great principles of the art of war. The general strategical lesson of the period which Mr. Corbett wishes to emphasize seems to be the "limitation of maritime power." Few men of the time saw that "there is a point beyond which hostilities by naval action alone cannot advance. It was an army that was wanting." And the "real object of Essex and the military reformers," though ostensibly a reorganization of the land forces with a view to coast defence, was, Mr. Corbett thinks, to form a corps for service beyond the seas, "a force that could reap where the fleet had sown."

So it is that the book deals largely with military as well as naval operations, for how closely interdependent are the sister services in a great war "nothing," says Mr. Corbett, "shows more emphatically than the last years of the Elizabethan war." "Indeed," he adds, "it is not too much to say that the campaign in which Mountjoy and Carew saved Ireland affords the first example in modern history of a naval force being rightly used by a military commander as a fourth arm."

The book has further, as was to be expected, great biographical interest. With the delightful magic of the historian's art the author has conjured from the dusty lurking-places of libraries and archives a cluster of great Elizabethan figures and made them glow upon his pages in living colors. There is the romantic, tragic, "almost inconceivable" Essex, who for a time was "to fill the place of Drake as the embodiment of the war spirit in England, a man who, had he been born like Drake into a station where all was to win by slow and persistent effort, might have hardened into one of the greatest figures of his time." Upon him indeed Mr. Corbett thinks, as Essex himself loved to dream, Drake's mantle fell rather than upon any other. The chief biographical interest of the book, however, centres perhaps about the enigmatic and scarcely less tragic figure of Raleigh, whom Mr. Corbett reluctantly feels compelled to deny a "high

and heroic part" in the last years of the war and whose reputation as an admiral "is scarcely less difficult to explain than that which Essex enjoyed in his lifetime." By the "bulk of his contemporaries he was detested as no better than a pushing and selfish adventurer. For us that view of him is forgotten and forgiven in his prophetic dream of empire and the witchery of his tuneful pen;" but "no single exploit, no single well-timed resolution lifts him amongst the great captains. His immortal Virginian dream, failure as it was, is his real monument. If that be put aside, and if, by an effort hardly possible, we can free our judgment from the spell of his pen and personality in order to follow dispassionately his career at sea, it will look as cold and bare to us, as it did to those of his contemporaries who were best able to judge."

Besides these two, many other great Elizabethans live and move in Mr. Corbett's pages: Vere, the dashing hero of the Low Country wars, Mountjoy, the defender of Ireland, and his trusty lieutenant "good George Carew," the old Lord Admiral whose service against the Spaniards lasted long after the glory of 1588, stout-hearted Lord Thomas Howard who deserves a place amongst the highest in the roll of Elizabeth's great sailors, Cumberland the great privateering earl, first to conquer the "virgin city of the Indies." On the Spanish side, too, apart from the ill-starred Sidonia, Drake's old foe, who still more helpless than in 1588 witnesses the triumph of Drake's successors, we meet many glorious names, above all perhaps Spinola, over the achievements of whose courage and skill Mr. Corbett lingers not only with the impartiality of the true historian, but with such unfeigned admiration as a great commander, whether friend or foe, elicits from a true lover of the great game of war.

As to the further contents of the brilliant historical narrative, a summary will not be out of place. After a description of the complex opening war moves of the year 1596, we see the Spaniards take Calais and England preparing the great expedition to Cadiz, which Mr. Corbett proceeds to tell most carefully and graphically on the basis of rich original authorities which he discusses in a learned and valuable appendix.

Mr. Corbett gives us further a careful account of Philip's three revengeful attempts to repeat with better success the enterprise of 1588, the "New Armada," the "Last Armada," and the armada which never even started for its destination, giving rise to the gibe, really a sigh of relief, that, having begun with an Armada Invincible, he had ended with an "Armada Invisible." The naval mobilization to meet this Armada is noteworthy, as is also the first great galley feat of Spinola, who now opens his brief but dazzling career. On the English side we have, after the dispersion of the "New Armada," the last attempt to invade Spain, a kind of futile invisible counter-armada, followed by the "Islands Voyage" with Raleigh's gallant deeds at Tagal to give a little tinge of brightness to his new portrait, and with the breathlessly interesting story of the missing of the treasure fleet.

After a fine graphic description of Cumberland's capture of Puerto Rico and a short sad chapter on the decline of the navy at the close of

the century which had seen the rise of English maritime power, we come to the most valuable account of "one of the few serious attempts to put in practice the strategical dream of attacking England through Ireland," the failure of which Mr. Corbett attributes to "the yet unmeasured power of the sea" and to "two sagacious soldiers who felt the mastery it gave."

After Cezimbra Road the narrative of events closes fittingly with the tragic chapter called "The Last of the Galleys" enabling Mr. Corbett to end his work on the Tudor navy as he began it, with strong emphasis upon the transition from the warship of the Middle Ages to the type which pointed to Nelson and Trafalgar. It is pleasant too that the galley should have emerged from this last trial, if not with success, yet with high honor to itself and above all to Spinola, whose greatness, however, only served to reveal with increased conclusiveness the superiority of the northern school.

Though the narrative proper ends with the Dutch bullet that stretched intrepid Spinola upon his galley deck, there remain two valuable chapters discussing the results of the long war and the navy as Elizabeth left it. "In spite," Mr. Corbett concludes, "of all that seems at first sight so old-fashioned in the instruments and ideas which Drake and his successors used, they differed only in design, and that in no large degree, from those with which Nelson brought the art to its zenith."

While it is possible that future writers may modify some of Mr. Corbett's verdicts, they will not alter the fact that he has written an excellent volume upon a period greatly in need of illumination. Amphibious as the heroes he has portrayed so well, he proves himself, whether describing operations of war by land or sea, equally instructing, stimulating and brilliant.

W. F. TILTON.

Thomas Hariot, the Mathematician, the Philosopher, and the Scholar : developed chiefly from Dormant Materials, with Notices of his Associates, including Biographical and Bibliographical Disquisitions upon the Materials of the History of 'Ould Virginia.' By HENRY STEVENS of Vermont, F.S.A. (London: Privately printed. 1900. Pp. xii, 214.)

THE editor of this book, Mr. Henry N. Stevens, tells us that the whole text has lain "printed off" since 1885; and the printing was commenced in January, 1878. Nevertheless, its contents have not been forestalled. Nothing has appeared about Harriotts, since the earlier date, more important than the good but unoriginal article in the *Dictionary of National Biography* and three pages of critical estimate in the second volume of Dr. Moritz Cantor's *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Mathematik*. During the eight years of its printing, this volume grew by the accumulation of successive discoveries, and thus cannot be quoted as containing any definite opinions, as the author himself warns us. "Repetition, and perhaps some contradiction, are acknowledged. But meandering thoughts and ill-digested narratives, though tedious, are not criminal." They are not only not criminal, but to a careful student, they

are more valuable than a unitary working-over of them might be. Certainly nothing in this little volume is in the least tedious. To one condemned to pass a large proportion of his time in reading the writings of German scientists who glory in writing awkwardly, and have carried that art to its last pitch of perfection, a style like this is simply delicious. Though Stevens uses the spelling "Harriot" throughout, yet in the last testament appended to this essay, the name at every occurrence appears as Harriotts. An *s* very easily gets dropped from the end of the name of a writer, because it so often occurs in the possessive case; and doubled consonants in names were usually made single in latinization; as Copernicus for Koppernik, and Keplerus for Keppler. In the signature to a letter, printed as "Harriote," a final *s* may have been inadvertently taken for an *e*; *s* final, in much of the chirography of that period, looking a good deal like a modern *e*.

Our acquaintance with the man has hitherto been limited to a skeleton biography and a few slight notices, together with a treatise upon algebra based upon his papers but drawn up by another person. How is this acquaintance improved by the new publication? First, we are now presented with a speaking portraiture of his character and life. Next, Harriotts' will had eluded more than one accomplished huntsman for such documents; but from the moment when our Vermonter entered upon the search the snuggest of *catiches* could no longer secure it from being drawn to light. So here it is, printed in full; and it affords us, aside from more general information, certain significant hints regarding the contents of the scientific papers the testator left behind him. Thirdly, the first half of a letter to Harriotts relating to his observations in astronomy has, for a century, figured in the history of that science, having been unearthed, talked about, and ultimately published, by Baron Franz von Zach. The original is presumed to be still at Petworth Castle. But Stevens found the other half of the letter (bearing the signature of a person never suspected as its writer); and everybody will pronounce it to be much the more important half. Fourthly, Harriotts, in his will, directed that N. Thorperley should receive his "mathematicall writings . . . to the end that after hee doth understand them hee may make use in penninge such doctrine that belonges unto them for publike uses as it shall be thought convenient by my Executors and him selfe;" after which the papers were "to be putt into a convenient truncke with a locke and key and to be placed in my Lord of Northumberlandes Library and the key thereof to be delivered into his Lordshipps hands." But Stevens produces facts which go far to indicate that Thorperley was not only utterly indolent in the performance of the duty so imposed upon him, but was a person of the worst judgment in regard to such duty, and furthermore, was by no means as appreciative of what was entrusted to him as it is desirable that a literary executor should be. And to those facts Stevens adds others which prove that von Zach, who next went through the papers, did so quite cursorily, to use no harsher word, while by eliminating seven-eighths of them (which went to the British Museum) he rendered it difficult for

other mathematicians who subsequently examined them (even had they been animated by a historical spirit which did not belong to their generation), to ascertain what the real historical value of the writings might be.

Mr. Stevens thinks that he has given strong grounds for believing that great injustice has been done to Harriotts as a mathematician ; but this cannot be admitted. There are many mathematicians who delight in conception but shrink before the labors of parturition. If Harriotts was not one of these, he was, at any rate, prevented by other business from publishing his discoveries, of which, however, he seems to have made no secret. Scientific men, not wishing to be led astray from their own studies into difficult questions of the history of science, have adopted the handy rule that priority of publication must decide to whom a discovery belongs. This is just enough ; for if a man does not take the necessary trouble to give the world his own account of his discoveries, how does he merit a crown of glory for that which he has done for his own satisfaction? Justice, however, is not the question for the historian of science. He wishes to know whether, at a given stage of intellectual development, a given generalization was within the reach of a whole class of minds or only of one hero, and what form it would take in different minds. That Harriotts followed Viète in algebra is unquestionable. His terminology and notation prove it ; and he himself acknowledges it. It is true that some of his scholars speak as if he had been in possession of some of Viète's methods before the latter published them in 1591 ; and this may be. It is hardly likely that his papers would show whether it were so or not. The achievement for which he has usually had the credit was the bringing all the terms of an equation to one side, and the regarding the quantic so obtained as a product of linear factors some one of which must vanish and furnish the solution. To have done this in the sixteenth century implies a high order of mathematical power. In addition to this, he is usually credited with the common method of finding rational roots of numerical equations, and with the general idea of resolving such equations by successive approximations. That is much. It is enough, in the judgment of most critics, to place him in the second rank of mathematicians—corresponding, let us say, to the rank of Horace, of Pope, of Wordsworth, of Lamartine, among poets. But this does not satisfy Mr. Stevens, who wishes him to be placed in the front rank—in the rank corresponding to Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, Goethe. But this is too much ; and Mr. Stevens simply does not know what it is that he asks. He reminds me of the fisherman who asked to have his wife made pope. Harriotts plainly did not belong to the mental gender of the gigantic generalizers. He is said to have been the first to obtain the area of a spherical triangle ; and such is the sort of mathematical discovery which we might hope that the examination of his papers would bring to light. Certainly the Savilian Professor who reported about 1788 (not in 1802) against publishing some of the manuscripts, however sound the advice may have been under the particular circumstances existing at that juncture, gave an absurd reason for it when he said that they “ could not con-

tribute to advance science." So the science of arithmetic was not advanced by the translation of the Rhind papyrus;—but the history of the human mind was greatly advanced. Rigand's later discussion of the question was too much in the same spirit. Merely for their probable mathematical interest, the papers would certainly repay the labor of examination.

Mr. Stevens rather timidly puts forth the suggestion that Harriotts invented the telescope before Galileo. But Galileo is not now regarded as the first inventor of the instrument. Stevens does not seem to be aware that Leonard Digges's *Pantometria* first appeared in 1571, and that the combination of lenses there described could hardly have been actually made by an intelligent experimenter without his discovering the telescope. Now we know that Harriotts in 1585 was showing the Indians in Virginia wonderful things with "perspective glasses." By a "perspective glass," at a somewhat later date, at any rate, was always understood a telescope; and in strictness nothing else ought to be so called. Still, even supposing that Harriotts's perspective glass was a *camera obscura*, which Baptista Porta had described in 1558; yet when we find him making "perspective trunks," which unquestionably were telescopes, in 1609, only about a year later than Hans Lippersley's application for a Dutch patent, and remember his habitual neglect to claim discoveries, for which his correspondents reproach him, it certainly does seem most probable that in examining the apparatus of that supposed *camera obscura*, he had observed phenomena which could not but lead a mind like his to making a telescope. It would be well worth while to examine his papers if only to find out how that was.

He observed the satellites of Jupiter so nearly at the same time as Galileo, that his papers ought to be carefully searched, in order to ascertain the precise date and circumstances of his first seeing them.

Moreover, it appears that Harriotts was the first of the series of English atomists, a series embracing minds as widely discrepant as Harriotts, Cudworth, Boyle, Shaftesbury, Hartley, Dalton, Maxwell. In other points, his philosophical opinions were original; but they remain obscure. This makes another urgent reason for a re-examination of his remains, to be followed, this time, by publication. America owes as much to Harriotts as England does. Is she not as able to afford the ways and means—in learning and in money—for such a publication as the mother country, who has spent so much, and so gloriously, upon history?

But, of course, until those papers shall have been examined, nothing at all can be claimed for Harriotts on the mere strength of probably exaggerated remarks by enthusiastic scholars addressing him in letters. Thus one of these, early in 1610, having just read Kepler's *De Motu Stellae Martis* says, "I remember long since you told me as much, that the motions of the planets were not perfect circles." Now, to have had that idea was certainly remarkable; but there is a million miles between that and Kepler's discovery, which Harriotts could not possibly have made, since he was not in possession of Tycho's observations.

But Mr. Stevens's book makes it clear to us that the worth of the man did not lie in his mathematical and scientific genius, rate it as high as you can, but in his fine character, his perfect fidelity, his freedom from personal views. His will evinces the same business-like care with which, through life, he had performed all those of his duties to which selfishness could not urge him.

The volume is pretty. It is not surpassingly so; but then, when the printing was begun, we were not yet tired to death of the rather fanciful imitation of the sixteenth-century Roman type. There is an index which seems to have an entry for about every fifty words of the text. I forgot to mention that there is interesting information in the book about de Bry, Jacques LeMoyne, Captain John White, William Sander-son, Robert Hues, and others. But I am too ignorant of American history to venture upon that ground.

C. S. PEIRCE.

Richelieu and the Growth of French Power. By JAMES BRECK PERKINS, LL.D. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1900. Pp. xiii, 359.)

ABOUT fifteen years ago Mr. Perkins presented studies of the great Cardinal in his *France under Mazarin*. Although he modestly called these a "Review of the Administration of Richelieu" they treated the subject almost as extensively as the present work, but with less emphasis on the personal side of Richelieu's career. The biography is not to be considered a mere rewriting of the same material. A comparison of the two accounts shows that Mr. Perkins has approached the subject with opinions substantially unchanged, and yet with his thought of it controlled by additional years of investigation and reflection. Indeed, it is remarkable to how small an extent there are verbal similarities in the statement of what is necessarily the same matter. Since his previous work the publication of two volumes of M. Hanotaux's *Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu*, a work which Mr. Perkins himself says "will remain the permanent record of the great Cardinal," has enabled Mr. Perkins to compare his own results upon the subject as far as 1618 with those of the distinguished French historian and statesman. The conception of the man in the pages of the two writers is not dissimilar. Upon one's first reading of Mr. Perkins's description of Richelieu's earlier career one feels that he has made the transformation of the Cardinal's conduct too abrupt at the time of his accession to power. The ambitious intriguer, who uses the bishopric of Luçon merely as a stepping-stone, and who is not above taking the attitude of fulsome and servile flattery towards the Queen-Mother, suddenly appears as the farsighted statesman, who was selfish, it is true, but only because he had determined to be himself the instrument of carrying into effect his designs. A second reading shows this to be a carefully worked out conception of Richelieu's career. Hanotaux puts the matter in this way: "Jusque-là, il avait marché, contraint et courbé, dans les avenues de l'ambition et de l'intrigue. À peine au pouvoir, sa taille se redresse," etc.

Like all Mr. Perkins's other works on France this is a reader's book ; it lures one on from paragraph to paragraph and chapter to chapter. The student who is interested in the administrative side of the period may quarrel with the arrangement of matter which hides away important administrative changes among other things of less moment. For example, the explanation of the larger use of intendants during Richelieu's administration is crowded in between remarks on public education and upon the rise of the press. There is room for a difference of opinion upon the relative importance of such matters, but there is hardly any phenomenon of French political life of greater moment than the rigorous subordination of local authorities to the central government, and so the causes of this system are particularly interesting. Occasionally it seems that Mr. Perkins must be studying the seventeenth century from the standpoint of later times, rather than from that of the historic development of the French administrative and economic system. He refers to the exemption of the land of the nobility from the *taille* as if this were surprising, but not two centuries had elapsed since the king had taken from the nobility their ancient right to the *taille*. It was too early for the nobility to be asked to become themselves *taillable*. In giving Richelieu credit for his successful attempts to build an effective navy Mr. Perkins somewhat exaggerates the power of the fleet which was constructed. He says, "Probably it could have met on equal terms the navy of any other European nation." But this was the period of the greatest effectiveness of the Dutch fleet, which, according to Captain Mahan, remained until 1674 equal to the French and English fleets combined. These are minor matters which in no way affect the interest or the value of the book as a biography of Richelieu.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

Oliver Cromwell. By JOHN MORLEY, M.P. (New York: Century Company. 1900. Pp. xiv, 486.)

Oliver Cromwell. By THEODORE ROOSEVELT. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. x, 260.)

MR. MORLEY'S book is the result of very careful study ranging over the whole field of Cromwellian literature. He shows not only that thorough acquaintance with the writings of Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Firth which is indispensable to everyone who now approaches the subject, but he has tested their conclusions by an examination of so much of the source material as has been printed and is easily accessible. His labors have been so indefatigable that where he differs in opinion from these two "giants of research" we may assume that the difference is intentional and in no case due to mere carelessness. Such thoroughness is a remarkable achievement for so busy a man as Mr. Morley, but it has an inevitable limitation. It is manifestly impossible for even a Morley to examine *all* the sources for the period without giving up his life to the task, or even to examine *all* the sources bearing upon merely the more im-

portant problems which constantly pressed upon him for solution. In just so far, therefore, his conclusions will rest upon insecure foundations. Mr. Morley's variations from the conclusions of Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Firth are numerous and are in general in the way of disparagement of Cromwell's motives. In the case of the Self-Denying Ordinance, both Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Firth look upon Cromwell's actions as straightforward and sincere, while to Mr. Morley they appear "oblique." Mr. Morley is also not entirely convinced of Cromwell's complete ignorance of the proposed disbanding of Barebone's Parliament. Since Mr. Morley's conclusions have the disadvantage of resting upon more or less incomplete information, he will not take it ill if they are forced to run the gauntlet of a somewhat severer scrutiny than would otherwise be the case. In general, it may be said that those who know Cromwell best have the most favorable opinion of both his sincerity and his intentions.

Mr. Morley has the true historian's gift of sympathy. Not only Cromwell but the minor characters are real and move in the real world of the seventeenth century. It is seldom indeed that an incident is taken out of its historical setting and judged by modern standards. One case may be mentioned where something very like this took place, where the full weight of Cromwell's mistaken Irish policy is thrown upon his own shoulders, whereas Mr. Morley himself knows well that Cromwell was in this as in so many of his mistakes a typical Englishman of his time. But in general it may be said that Mr. Morley has satisfactorily solved the difficult task of giving to his figure a historical background.

Mr. Morley's historical method differs in two particulars from that of the more severe school of modern historians. He looks at history from a strongly moral point of view. He still believes that it is the province of the historian not merely to explain but to administer praise and blame. Some of the most interesting passages in the book are in answer to Carlyle, who also praised and blamed, but erratically. The historian of the present day is inclined to look askance at such judgments, because of the danger one runs of trying former ages by the standards of our own. He is not so much concerned to pass judgment on the righteousness of an historical action, as he is anxious correctly to understand it. If he can explain just what happened, why it happened, and what consequences followed, he is satisfied. In the case of Mr. Morley, furthermore, the interests of the statesman sometimes control the interests of the historian, and even color his views. Current questions of English politics, the Irish question, imperialism, appear furtively in his pages, and few of his readers will wish them gone. They offer a departure, however, from the severer historical method of exposition, since they are usually not history but politics. This is intended, however, merely as a distinction, not as a criticism.

Mr. Morley must be pleased with the way in which the publishers have done their part. It is a book of rare beauty, filled with some sixty well-executed portraits. The general literary public, for whom the work is primarily intended, will be delighted by the breadth of view, the im-

partial judgment and finished style which it has learned to expect in Mr. Morley's books. The historian will read it with pleasure and profit, but the serious student will return with undiminished loyalty to his Gardiner and his Firth.

One does not read many pages in Mr. Roosevelt's book without grave misgivings. The only authorities he sees fit to mention are Macaulay and Carlyle. Nothing is said of Mr. Gardiner or of Mr. Firth, whose writings it may be said with hardly an exaggeration, have superseded all others. Mr. Roosevelt might plead, to be sure, that life is short and Gardiner is long, but the obvious answer would be that anyone who has not time to read and re-read Mr. Gardiner's delightful though voluminous pages has not time to write a life of Cromwell. It would be rash to assert that Mr. Roosevelt has not read them, but it is safe to say that he has done so to no particular purpose. To him, Laud is a "small narrow man" with a "silly" policy of enforced uniformity. Wentworth is a traitor to the Parliamentary cause who "had obtained his price" from the King. Cromwell is a noble man whose early promise was blasted by personal ambition, "cursed with a love of power."

Mr. Roosevelt is ill at ease in the seventeenth century. It is in fact a hard century to understand since it is enough like our own to mislead us continually by false analogies. But Mr. Roosevelt's method of avoiding the difficulty by substituting the modern analogy in every case and arguing quietly upon that, is the worst possible. The book may in fact be described as a slight thread of Cromwellian narrative, taken from more or less old-fashioned writers, explained and amplified by references to Mr. Roosevelt's own experiences and to events of American history, especially of recent American history. Sometimes the analogies are utterly misleading, sometimes the transitions are so sudden and unexpected as to border upon the comic. One does not get far in the following without exclaiming, "The Germans of New York!" "The Puritan fashion for regulating, not merely the religion, but the morals and the manners of their neighbors, especially in the matter of Sunday observance and pastimes generally, was peculiarly exasperating to men of a more easy-going nature. Even nowadays, the effort for practical reform in American city government is rendered immeasurably more difficult by the fact that a considerable number of the best citizens are prone to devote their utmost energies, not to striving for the fundamentals of social morality, civic honesty, and good government, but, in accordance with their own theory of propriety of conduct, to preventing other men from pursuing what these latter regard as innocent pleasures; while, on the other hand, a large number of good citizens, in their irritation at any interference with what they feel to be legitimate pastimes, welcome the grossest corruption of misrule rather than submit to what they call 'Puritanism.'" This is harmless enough. A much more serious case is where Cromwell's constitutional difficulties are compared to those of Washington and Lincoln and he is judged harshly for not ruling as constitutionally as they did. One will look long for a book in which one

period of history is so systematically judged by the light of another. To Mr. Roosevelt, recent progress may be summed up in the two phrases religious and political liberty, and he looks at every event of the seventeenth century through these spectacles. The result is a distinct curiosity in historical literature. Externally, the book is a handsome volume, uniform in binding with the author's *Rough Riders*. It has numerous illustrations, for the most part interesting and well chosen, though the propriety of including fanciful battle-scenes by a modern illustrator may well be questioned.

GUERNSEY JONES.

Napoleon: The Last Phase. By Lord ROSEBERY. (New York : Harper and Brothers. 1901. Pp. 284.)

To read a book by an Englishman which treats without prejudice the *dirus Hannibal* of Great Britain yields one a novel pleasure. After Waterloo, Napoleon's life presents little which interests the student of his greater deeds ; for except to check off historical misstatements, the sifting of the years in St. Helena is barren. Yet Lord Rosebery has made a readable volume by his discrimination in awarding praise and blame. Except for short digressions on the great Corsican's loss of balance by superhuman successes, on his "supreme regrets," and on the estimate of man, ruler and captain, Lord Rosebery confines himself to a marshalling of evidence, and a description of the *dramatis personae*. He handles Sir Hudson Lowe, that "unfit representative of Britain," without gloves. Living in the only good residence on the island, with a salary of £12,000 a year, "hapless and distracted Lowe" was a childish, petty tyrant of the great prisoner in his charge, for the maintenance of whose *entourage* of fifty-one people in a collection of huts which had been constructed as a cattle-shed, a paltry £8,000 was awarded—though later this pittance was increased. "There are few names in history so unfortunate as Lowe's." His absence of gentlemanly instincts and his quarrelsomeness made a difficult situation intolerable, and covered him with ridicule worse than ignominy.

Of Napoleon's suite each member is fairly characterized : sympathetic Grand Marshal Bertrand and his lovely wife ; the voluminous, Boswellian, but mysterious and unreliable Las Cases ; suave Montholon, the blind devotee ; mendacious Antomarchi, the physician, and O'Meara, M.D., of the long and worthless book ; that "fretful porcupine" Gourgaud, whose impertinences, because of his devotion, Napoleon so patiently overlooked, and who in his lachrymose diary has unwittingly given us a picture of the Emperor in his last years "almost brutal in its raw realism." What has been written of this period also comes in for criticism : Warden's literary inventiveness, the fabrications of Santini, the so-called *Letters from the Cape*, Lady Malcolm's *Conversations from Napoleon* and others. Scott's estimate of the great man is weighed and found wanting. If only for its culling-out of historical myths and lies, the book would have a distinct value.

The picture of Napoleon is faithful. Retaining his power of fascination so that even the crews of the ships which deported him grew fond of the man, and that every visitor felt its influence ; insisting on his ancient ceremonial until his aides and attendants almost dropped from the fatigue of standing ; dining on gold and silver plate, though he finished the meal in twenty minutes' time ; driving with coach and six—though indeed the roads of St. Helena accounted for this ; reading voraciously the books supplied him, among which the Bible (not from religious motives however), Homer, Aeschylus, Euripides, and other classics were prominent ; like Voltaire's *Candide*, digging in his garden, and obliging all about him to lend a hand ; never unoccupied, but always ineffably bored ; growing fat and pudgy and careless of his dress, yet in bearing still "the Emperor," we see, from Lord Rosebery's résumé, the man as he actually was, up to the day when cancer of the stomach ended his abnormal career.

The farce is detailed of the French, Austrian and Russian Commissioners, charged "to assure themselves of Napoleon's presence," and yet unable to get a sight of him, so sedulously did he keep within his own domain ; and a sketch is given of "amorous Montchenu," a "mountebank" Napoleon called him ; of Balmain, the dignified and amiable Russian, who alone had orders (from his master Alexander) to show Napoleon "les égards personnels qu'on lui doit ;" of the neutral Austrian *Stürmer*. Their quarrels with Lowe were constant ; and though it was a physical impossibility for Napoleon to escape, both they and Sir Hudson were ever ridden by the nightmare of such an event.

Napoleon had been crowned as Emperor by the Pope and accepted as such by all Europe ; yet on his deportation he was ordered to be treated as "a general out of employment ;" and to this low rank his St. Helena gaoler would fain have degraded him. But Napoleon rose superior to this affront. In every instance where Lowe matched himself against Napoleon's dignity, he lost. Yet Napoleon's personal bearing towards Lowe was "imperturbably calm," writes Lavalette, only on rare occasions descending to any expression of indignation.

Overbearing enough in his years of success, captivity appears to have brought out Napoleon's native amiability. Even Gourgaud's impudent reply : "Yes, Sire, provided that history does not say that France was very great before Napoleon, but was partitioned after him," was passed over in silence. A caged animal, "gagged and paralyzed by Europe because his was too gigantic a force," he lapsed into neither ferocity nor laziness.

Lord Rosebery deems Roederer's report of Napoleon's conversations to be the most exact. "Concise, frank, sometimes brutal, but always interesting" was the Emperor's real talk. Las Cases pads, Montholon lacks intelligence ; O'Meara translates ; Gourgaud painted him from one standpoint.

So unduly sensitive to English newspaper criticism that he learned a little English in order to understand it, yet Napoleon never caught its spirit. There was no lapse in intellectual ability, but it took shape solely in talk, for he had dictated so many years that he quite lost his power to

use a pen. His views of what he might have accomplished in the Orient by heading a Mahometan movement were vastly exaggerated. His supreme regret was that he had not fallen at Borodino or Waterloo—death on the field would have rounded his career.

Not lacking in kindly virtues, Napoleon, though he possessed devoted followers, had no friends. As Emperor, his test of friendship was utility; afterwards it was too late to create friendships. As with most very great men, the world either worshipped or hated him.

Lord Rosebery's summary, in the last chapter, of Napoleon's character and powers is strong and judicious. That he so markedly overcomes his English prejudices reminds one that the century, in the first years of which Napoleon rose to supreme power, has passed away. In a recent article in the *Atlantic* Dr. Goldwin Smith gives us the old-fashioned British view, and its bitterness stands out in marked contrast to Lord Rosebery's equipoise.

The book is luxuriously made up, the paper being almost inconveniently thick; the type is large and clear; and the manufacture worthy of the distinguished author and great subject.

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

Daniel O'Connell and the Revival of National Life in Ireland. By ROBERT DUNLOP, M.A. ["Heroes of the Nations" Series.] (G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York and London. 1900. Pp. xv, 393.)

THIS volume appears to the present reviewer to be fully up to, but not above, the average of this series. We are not justified in looking to publications of this kind for additions to our knowledge, and none such seems to be attempted here. But it is a clear and interesting treatment, based apparently on a considerable knowledge of the secondary material and on some work with the sources, O'Connell's letters and speeches being used with good effect. The critic will be somewhat embarrassed by the total absence of all references or bibliographical indications, and in connection with this it might be said that even if the writers in this series are debarred from foot-notes, there seems no good reason why a slight sketch of the material used should not be given in some other part of the volume. The amount of space thus taken would be imperceptible, and it is difficult to see that even the most delicate sensibilities would be unpleasantly affected.

The author's treatment is closely chronological. Although written with strong Irish sympathies, the narrative is usually an impartial one, and little indication is given of personal, political, or religious views. The reviewer indeed feels that justice is scarcely done Peel, but is ready to believe that what seems to him somewhat misleading references are due rather to inadequate study of the Peel papers and to limited space than to any wilful blindness to Peel's energy and earnestness in Irish affairs. O'Connell's principles and methods are brought out very clearly;

on the other hand the writer fails to bring strongly before us his personality, or to fully explain his wonderful power over the Irish people. Another weak side of the book is its failure to bring clearly before us the actual conditions in Ireland either when O'Connell began his work or when he ended it. Neither land nor electoral conditions are explained; there is little or no definite explanation of administrative institutions or methods; we are not shown fully what "Emancipation" meant or what still was lacking after it had been achieved; except in regard to national spirit, we get little information as to development of any kind. The book is further somewhat lacking in perspective; the hero is not put in a satisfactory historical setting, and the general appreciations are weak.

The author declares in his preface that the volume "is not offered to the public as a mere verbal expansion of the article I contributed a few years ago to the *Dictionary of National Biography*." The reviewer is unable to concur in this statement, for it seems to him that the book is clearly but little more than a "verbal expansion" of that excellent article, and that he will not be misleading anyone in asserting that nearly as much will be got from the article of eighteen pages as from this volume of 389. The effort to popularize to which the author has given himself seems to consist mainly in diluting the earlier treatment with matter of a journalistic order got largely from the notes to Fitzpatrick's *Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell* (New York, 1888, two vols.); and it seems proper to call attention to the peculiar *verbatim* manner in which much of this gossippy material is borrowed, though without any reference whatever to Fitzpatrick. This will be best shown by putting some extracts in parallel columns:

Dunlop.

P. 20. (O'Connell's marriage.) This displeased his uncle Maurice "who in fact had already singled out a suitable partner for him in the person of Miss Mary Ann Healy, a mature spinster of short stature, but remarkably long purse and nose. Indeed so seriously did her personal appearance threaten to damage her matrimonial prospects, that in making his will her father thought it only right to increase her portion expressly 'on account of her nose.'"

P. 152. (Mission to London, 1825.) "the deputation attracted considerable attention in passing

Fitzpatrick.

I. p. 12:—"Miss Healey was a mature spinster, short in stature, but famous for her long purse—and nose. This organ threatened to militate so gravely against the future prospects of the lady, that her uncle, when writing his will, was urged to make her fortune larger 'on account of her nose.'"

I. 95:—"The Irish political missionaries, as they wended their way through England, attracted

through the principal towns on their route, especially O'Connell, who in his large cloak—a survival to all appearance of the ancient Irish mantle—formed a conspicuous object on the box of the landau.”

much attention, especially in the smaller towns. We learn from contemporary account that O'Connell mainly arrested the public gaze. He sat on the box of a landau with a large cloak—seemingly a revival of the ancient Irish mantle—folded around him.”

We need not delay on the question whether the popularizer owes anything to those whom he despoils. Here the object is rather to show that the author has not done the kind and quantity of additional work that we are justified in looking for. The expansion of the brief biographical sketch into the volume which should adequately represent O'Connell as the “Hero” of the Irish nation, would seem to have called for not only the popularizing element that is here supplied, but more especially such a fuller consideration of Irish conditions and development in connection with the hero's work as should adequately show the connections between them, and leave us with a clearer conception of what the hero and his work represent in Irish and British history.

Another very considerable element in this “expansion” is large quotations from O'Connell's papers and speeches. This is entirely praiseworthy, but the method employed is by no means satisfactory. Apart from the fact that no references whatever are given for such extracts, and that the exact dates are most irritatingly missing, the author reproduces this matter in the third person, though at a length usually as great as if it had been given in O'Connell's exact language.

In spite of these defects the book will be a useful one. It is clear and pleasant reading, is accurate and well-arranged (Fitzpatrick's somewhat confused and gossippy compilation is occasionally straightened out), and is animated by fair spirit and by generous though not extreme enthusiasm. The illustrations are helpful (a map of Ireland should have been included), and the index passably good. VICTOR COFFIN.

The Forward Policy and its Results, or Thirty-five Years' Work amongst the Tribes on Our North-Western Frontier of India. By RICHARD ISAAC BRUCE, C.I.E., formerly Political Agent, Belúchistán, late Commissioner and Superintendent, Derajat Division, Punjab, India. (London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1900. Pp. xxviii, 382.)

Eighteen Years in the Khyber, 1879-1898. By Col. Sir ROBERT WARBURTON, K.C.I.E., C.S.I. (London: John Murray. 1900. Pp. [18], 351.)

THE Indian Frontier question is not a new one, nor have the problems connected with it received final solution, yet these two books will

do much to clarify the subject, for both are by men who know whereof they write. Mr. Bruce was the assistant and right-hand man of Sir Robert Sandeman and his book is, therefore, in great part a record of events already made familiar in Thornton's *Life of Sandeman*. The story of Mr. Bruce's life in India from 1862 to 1896 is one full of adventure and rich in political experience. Tribal management on the lines laid down by Sir Robert Sandeman was unknown when Bruce was first appointed to a frontier district at Dera Ghazi Khan under the Punjab government. The system then in force was that of Lord Lawrence; the main idea was that British officers were never to cross the border on official business, that they were to avoid every step tending to extend the frontier and that in the event of disturbance beyond British jurisdiction a punitive expedition was to be made if the case demanded. It has been called the Close-Border system, for non-intervention beyond the frontier was the maxim. In the Punjab a conciliatory policy modified the stringency of these rules but in Sind the protection of the frontier depended to a great extent upon a military force. Sandeman ended this in Baluchistan by his success in negotiating a treaty with the Khan of Khelat in 1876. His policy has been described as a "system of conciliatory intervention tempered by lucrative employment and light taxation." Mr. Bruce defends this plan as a policy of civilization and as the true and just method of stopping local frontier disorder and of protecting India when the great day of invasion threatens. He describes in detail the workings of the system, being so enthusiastic as to claim that it could be enforced among tribes other than Baluch; and, in fact, he denies that there is any essential difference between Baluch and Patan and says they are both "open and amenable to the same influences" (p. 19). It has usually been held by other writers that there is a sharp distinction to be drawn between the two, that the Baluch is aristocratic, bowing to the decision of his chief, rarely influenced by religious bigotry, and not apt to join in fanatic outbreaks, and, on the other hand, that the Patan is more democratic, often refusing to obey his chief, who at best is only the head of the dominant faction in the tribe, and listening to priestly incitement to *Jihad*, the *Mullah* being often more powerful than the chief. The council or *Jirga* of the tribe in Patan territory is therefore a more factional body than in Baluchistan. Mr. Bruce bases his belief upon personal experience, but the weight of authority is against him.

During the years 1876 to 1888, when Mr. Bruce was with Sir Robert Sandeman in Baluchistan he assisted in the pacification of the Khanate of Khelat, in the opening of trade routes long closed but which were now to be guarded by former plunderers, in the creation of Quetta as an outpost of empire, and in the administration of Baluchistan, then enjoying its first decade of law and order. The last eight years of his service Mr. Bruce spent as Commissioner in Derajat division under the Punjab government. He had opportunity, therefore, to judge frontier affairs from all sides, and his conclusions in the larger political issues are the more interesting when we examine the opinions of another writer serving on

a different post and trained in a different school. Colonel Warburton, the warden of the Khaibar Pass, had if possible a more exciting career than did Mr. Bruce. His mother was an Afghan lady, a niece of Dost Muhammad, Amir of Afghanistan, and his rare insight and ready sympathy in native affairs may be counted as among his greatest gifts. His period of service was marked by great changes; it was his honor to hold the famous Khaibar pass open to trade and travel "without a single European soldier or Sepoy being stationed in it beyond Jamrud." He left Peshāwar before the outbreak in 1897, but believed that he could have checked the tribesmen and kept the pass open in spite of *Mullah* fanaticism if he had remained on the ground; and his chapter on the subject is entitled "the Khyber débâcle." As regards the cause of this frontier war Colonel Warburton is not explicit, for he says that within three months of the outbreak there was no disturbing factor, and though he tells the story of the Turkish agent at Cabul, he does not give it much credence. Religious bigotry and personal ambition seem to have been the most important causes, though both he and Mr. Bruce object to the theory of a premeditated united attack all along the border. The literary style of both writers is that of the man who lives in the open. Mr. Bruce disarms criticism by frankly acknowledging his faults and Colonel Warburton did not live to revise his proofs. Repetition is common, and in the case of Mr. Bruce the reader grows weary at the minute record of the multitudinous "thanks of the Government of India." The happy day of uniform and reasonable spelling seems to be far off if we are to judge by the divergent methods here shown; and, since Sir William Hunter has given us a system which is at least workable, it is to be regretted that Indian officials should be unwilling to take pity on the reader, and should refuse to be orthodox in their spelling of Indian names.

In the matter of general policy Colonel Warburton is as emphatic as Mr. Bruce in declaring the old Punjab method to be a failure; they defend the character of the tribesmen and claim that by having the right men in charge the entire frontier can be peaceably handled; they deplore the use of the native *Arbab* or middleman in dealing with trans-frontier tribes, pleading for a single-headed frontier commission which shall do away with inconsistency and vacillation. The plan in vogue in the Punjab to-day appears to regard the punitive expedition with its rewards for the military leaders as a natural result of the Forward Policy; in the meantime the "political" who maintains the peace along his section of the border is passed by. From another point of view the present policy is *prima facie* totally inadequate; and it is much more expensive than that advocated by Colonel Warburton, whether it really be the Sandeman system supported by Mr. Bruce, or some modification of it. Civilization and frontier defense as well as the Indian budget would then be well served.

ALFRED L. P. DENNIS.

The Peace Conference at the Hague and its Bearings on International Law and Policy. By FREDERICK W. HOLLS, D.C.L. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Pp. xxiv, 572.)

THE author of this book is a member of the New York bar and was secretary of the delegation from the United States to the Peace Conference at the Hague. He is described on the title-page as "a member of the Conference," which is not exact, for while he was permitted to take part in its discussions he had no authority to sign on behalf of our government. Nevertheless he was active in the work of the Conference and represented the United States in the *Comité d'Examen* which framed the Convention for the peaceful adjustment of international differences. He tells us that at a critical stage of the proceedings, when the reluctance of the German government to co-operate in the establishment of a permanent court of arbitration seemed likely to wreck the Conference, he accompanied Dr. Zorn of the German delegation to Berlin, consulted with Prince Hohenlohe and Count von Bülow, and succeeded in averting the crisis. It would certainly seem therefore, from a perusal of his book, that no one of the persons present, certainly none of those representing the government of the United States, had better opportunities than the author for observing what passed at the Hague and for learning the true motives that actuated the several governments.

Unfortunately, Mr. Holls has felt bound to observe a very disappointing silence on many of the topics upon which he might have been expected to be most interesting and instructive. It is apparent that in relating the history of the Conference he has been hampered at every turn by what he calls "the necessarily restricted limits open to members." Nor does this embarrassment exhibit itself only in the rather significant omissions from his narrative. It is even more apparent in the tone of eager, one might almost say indiscriminate, eulogy, bestowed upon every person and thing connected with the Conference. The building in which it met, the arrangements for conducting business, the luncheons set before the delegates, the handwriting of the Final Act, are all in turn the subjects of enthusiastic praise. This man's speech is "most eloquent and brilliant," the other man's is "of great force and beauty." This delegate is distinguished by "noble idealism," the next by "sound judgment," the next by "unerring prudence," the next by "perfection of decision and tact." The only unamiable word for which the author finds occasion, except when he speaks of those who thought ill of the Conference, is in connection with the Fourth of July celebration at Delft. He is compelled to admit that upon that day the weather was "inclement"; but he makes amends by adding that it "moderated" in the afternoon.

The author has also apparently considered that the limits of his work could not with propriety be extended so as to embrace any events occurring since the adjournment of the Conference. He has not even informed us of the fate of any of the measures adopted by it. Three "Conventions" and three "Declarations" were voted by a majority of the Powers

represented, but each of these six proposed contracts expressly provided that they might be signed at a later date by any of the other parties. Neither the second convention, with respect to the laws and customs of war on land, nor the third convention, for the adaptation to maritime warfare of the Geneva Convention of August 22, 1864, was signed at the time by the United States, or by Germany, or Austria, or Great Britain. Have they been signed or ratified since. Mr. Holls does not tell us. And why did these, the chief naval and military powers of the world, then decline to join in these important treaties?

So with respect to the first and most important convention, for the peaceful adjustment of international differences. The fact is (although it is not stated in Mr. Holls's book) that that convention has now been ratified by all the powers which were represented at the Conference, except China, Greece, Luxemburg, Mexico, Persia, Servia, Switzerland, Turkey and Bulgaria. This curious agglomeration of non-Christian and weak Christian nations must have some significance. Why did these particular countries delay giving a final assent to a treaty which was designed to substitute justice and reason in the place of force? And why did the strongest and most warlike nations so readily accept it?

Such are some of the questions which Mr. Holls's book suggests, and which he has apparently thought himself bound to leave unanswered. It is the more to be regretted, because he is evidently competent to deal with these subjects, as his interesting work clearly shows. If we criticize it, it is because there is not more of it.

The purpose of the book, as declared in the preface, is to give "the story of the Conference and a description of its work" especially for American and English readers. Accordingly, the author in his first two chapters gives an account of the calling of the Conference and of its first meeting. The text of the official circulars of invitation is given in full, as are also the ceremonial addresses at the opening. A complete list of the members, with brief biographical notes as to each, should prove useful.

The next three chapters deal in turn with the work of the three committees into which the conference divided itself. The recommendations of the several committees are considered point by point, and are elucidated by the author's comments and explanations, and by copious extracts from the discussions in committee or in the full Conference. The sixth chapter relates the unsuccessful efforts made by the delegates from the United States to secure action upon the question of immunity of private property upon the high seas, a subject upon which agreement proved impossible, and which was "referred to a future Conference." These four chapters are the best in the book. The comments and debates on the various provisions recommended are vivid and instructive, and indeed are essential to a clear understanding of what was accomplished.

The seventh chapter treats of "The Conference from Day to Day," and the eighth chapter closes the book with a discussion as to the bearings of the Conference upon international law and policy. In an ap-

pendix, the full text of all the conventions, declarations and final resolutions are given in the original French, accompanied by a careful English translation in parallel columns; also the full text of the reports made by the individual members of the American delegation, the report of the delegation itself to the Secretary of State, and finally, the addresses delivered at the tomb of Grotius in the Great Church of Delft on the rainy Fourth of July, 1899.

Looking at the tangible results of the Conference, one is naturally led to ask what is likely to be the practical value of its work. Mr. Holls answers the question without the very least hesitation. He "frankly avows his conviction that the peace Conference accomplished a great and glorious result, not only in the humanizing of warfare and the codification of the laws of war, but, above all, in the promulgation of the Magna Charta of International Law." He believes that a long first step has been taken towards the establishment of a system that will substitute law for force in international relations; and that, as a result, "the glamour of the supposed strength of reactionary government, or of the comforts of superstition will be gone, Faith will revive, the 'struggle of the soul' will be won, and general discontent, the basis of all unrest, must correspondingly diminish."

One may be permitted to doubt whether these tremendous results are likely to be achieved, even if all the recommendations of the Conference meet with general and loyal support; but that its recommendations may be made to produce permanent results of great value, is, no doubt, highly probable. The most striking and beneficent feature of the proposed agreement is to be found in the fact that the signatory Powers in effect declare that no war can hereafter be justified until good offices and mediation and arbitration have all been tried and have all failed. No one can as yet foresee how effectual this declaration will prove. But if the work of the Conference shall only tend to turn public attention in times of excitement towards the means by which war may honorably be averted,—if it only serves to point out several paths by which contending nations may find a way to peace,—it will have accomplished a task for which all nations may rightly praise it.

It remains only to be said of the book under review that it is well printed, is reasonably free from typographical errors,—*procès verbeaux* being perhaps the worst,—and that it is furnished with an adequate index.

GEORGE L. RIVES.

Cabot Bibliography, with an Introductory Essay on the Careers of the Cabots, based upon an Independent Examination of the Sources of Information. By GEORGE PARKER WINSHIP. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co.; London: Henry Stevens, Son and Stiles. 1900. Pp. lii, 180.)

THIS handsome volume is an expansion of Mr. Winship's "Bibliography" published in 1897. Every student of early American history

will be glad of an index so complete and a guide so judicious to the much vexed subject of the Cabots and their voyages. Coming at the close of an active controversy it will be welcomed as a summary of the voluminous literature in English, French, German, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese concerning the event which gave to the English race an inchoate title to Northern America.

The introductory essay sets forth concisely that which the author conceives to be the solid residue of fact remaining over from a controversy of fifty years. It is written in the true historic spirit and with method and clearness. The numbers along the margins of the pages are those of the articles in the *Bibliography* which are considered to establish the conclusions in the text. Mr. Winship, however, brings out more strongly than any other English writer the probability of another voyage by Sebastian Cabot to the northeast coast of America in 1507 or 1508. This point has not been sufficiently elucidated and he is right in dwelling upon it, especially in the light of the report made by Marcantonio Contarini to the Venetian senate in 1536 (Art. 80). The ill-fated expedition to the La Plata is treated with much insight. The moral character of Sebastian Cabot is summed up with historic sanity, as that of an ordinary man of his day and generation—not an anachronistic, evangelical saint on the one hand, nor a perfidious liar and traitor on the other. The celebrated map of 1544 is discussed and its evidence as to the landfall of 1497 having been on Cape Breton Island is accepted as conclusive. In short Mr. Winship adopts the rules of practice of every law court and accepts one piece of definite, positive evidence as outweighing a wilderness of negative and contradictory conjecture. His reasons, however, for supposing that Sebastian Cabot, on his return to England, took up his residence at Bristol are not apparent.

The main body of the volume is the *Bibliography*, and that is divided into a bibliography of "sources" (or of writers before the year 1600) and of later or secondary authorities, including all the controversialists of recent years. The articles are numbered consecutively for easy reference, and the works cited have evidently been examined with care and are described with accuracy. The notes appended are very valuable and contain an impartial estimate of each work and, in the case of larger and more general treatises, references to the pages where the Cabot matter may be found. The *Bibliography* is as complete as such a work can possibly be. Some of the articles in popular magazines and newspapers during the Cabot celebration year might perhaps have been omitted, but in such a work fulness is an error on the right side. On the other hand mention might have been made of Champlain, and certainly it is due to Charlevoix. The edition of Navarrete's *Voyages* in quarto is the one usually found in large libraries, but there is also a later edition in octavo which is deserving of mention as is also D'Avezac's *Examen Critique* of Nicholl's life of Sebastian Cabot in the *Revue Critique d'Histoire* of April, 1870, which has been published separately. One reference, however, we do miss—the three-cent postage stamp of Newfoundland; for it

not only declares Bonavista to have been the landfall in 1497 but it gives a picture of the spot. This is the first instance of what may be called the "philatelic method" in history. It is heroic and disposes summarily of Gordian knots.

Some of the notes suggest remark. In Art. 374 there is a slip (probably in transcription), for Haliburton gives Trinity Bay, *Newfoundland*, as the landfall, not Nova Scotia. The note on Article 89 (the Desce-liers map) follows Mr. Coote's opinion that the map shows the results of Cartier's *first* voyage; but Mr. Harris was unquestionably right, in the discussion which followed its publication by Lord Crawford. It really contains all the results of Cartier's *second* voyage. There is also a misleading note at Art. 218 (Thorne's map) referring the legend solely to the Labrador coast. This map is in Hakluyt's *Divers Voyages*. There is a reproduction of it in the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* for 1897 at p. 192 and it will be seen at once upon inspection that the legend covers the coast from latitude 40° northwards. The La Cosa map (Art. 84) hardly receives the attention due to its importance. Mr. Ganong (Art. 359) is entitled to the entire credit of having first demonstrated that the Island of St. John in the 1544 map was not intended for Prince Edward Island, but for the Magdalen group, and, in Art. 398, it would have been more precise to have said that the Rev. Moses Harvey was the *first* to suggest the quadri-centennial of 1897, omitting the word "among."

Trifling matters such as these found after a close perusal of a volume containing so many thousands of references and critical estimations over the immense extent of the Cabot literature, establish the painstaking accuracy of this most valuable book. Every Cabot scholar should have it and if he should at any time be reproached with the unpractical nature of his studies he may refer to Art. 549 and point out that the rights of property abutting on the public streets of New York depend upon the common law of England and not on the Roman Dutch law *for the reason that John Cabot antedated Henry Hudson*.

S. E. DAWSON.

The Clergy in American Life and Letters. By DANIEL DULANY ADDISON. (New York and London: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Pp. ix, 400.)

THERE are no publishers in America more worthily respected than the Macmillan Company. There is no American scholar or man of letters more deservedly eminent than Professor Woodberry, of Columbia University. And among our younger Episcopal clergy, of the more liberal kind, there is none more energetic and devoted than the Reverend Daniel Dulany Addison. No book, then, could have a much happier origin than one which should proceed from his authorship, through the editorship of Professor Woodberry, to the lists of the Macmillans.

Whoever takes up *The Clergy in American Life and Letters*, with the agreeable anticipations thus excited, must feel, as he turns the pages, a growing sense of disappointment. In plain truth, the book proves to be

among the most salient pieces of evidence, if evidence were needed, of the mischief done both to scholarship and to authorship, not to speak of literature, by the prevalent custom of publication in hastily pre-arranged series. The precise genesis of this work, is, of course, a matter of conjecture. On general principles, one would infer from the result that the publishers, desirous of increasing their usefulness by the evocation of some "National Studies in American Letters," sensibly selected as editor of the series a scholarly essayist and poet, unquestionably among the few living Americans whose writings may be expected to survive; and that thereupon, being very busy and enterprising publishers, they confided the "National Studies" to his care. One would infer, furthermore, that this editor, himself among the most busy and stimulating professors of a university whose reputation is deservedly more than national, found his primary duties so absorbing as perforce to limit the time which he could devote to merely editorial labors; and so that, having selected for this "Study" an author whose character and ability justly commanded his confidence, he found himself unable to assist this author with any considerable supervision or suggestion. One would infer, finally, that this author, who had somewhat inadvertently agreed to finish his book at a fixed time, honestly did his best; but that his manifold distractions as a parish priest left him no leisure for such prolonged, concentrated mental processes as seem generally needful for the development of an intellectual conception into organic vitality. Such things are bound to happen when even the best of men find themselves in the grip of a series. Unless some such thing happened in this case, Mr. Addison's *Clergy* is incomprehensible. Undoubtedly it is so gentle in spirit, that to speak of it ungently seems heartless. The milk of human kindness exudes from every page. Whatever the case with students or readers, Mr. Addison may sleep nightly with a conscience void of offence towards any man concerning whom he has written. When one has said this, however, one has almost exhausted the commendation which is compatible with conscientious criticism.

According to the preface, "the book does not aim to be either exhaustive or encyclopaedic, but to give a general view of the literary work of those who, by their religious calling, may be included in the term 'the clergy.' It was thought that this could best be done by treating in sketches typical clergymen who were literary men, and then making a more extended examination of the most important writers—Dwight, Channing, Parker, Bushnell, Beecher and Brooks, who by their work would illustrate the whole subject.

"Sufficient biographical material has been introduced to give a background to the purely literary analysis. No attempt has been made to enter into theological discussion or criticism. Religious references occur only when rendered necessary because of the theological character of the books that are examined" (p. viii).

Already we are a good way from "the Clergy in American life," concerning which phase of his subject Mr. Addison has little more to say

than may be inferred from a typical excerpt: "The awe with which the clergyman was regarded reached a climax in the Sabbath morning, when he proceeded to the meeting house for worship. . . . When the discourse was concluded, sometimes called by admiring friends a 'large, nervous, and golden discourse,' the minister went back to the regular life of the manse, which means that he often worked in his garden, and sawed wood, and mingled with the people on terms of friendly interest. Within the parsonage or manse, or in the South the rectory, there was a wholesome, intellectual life, deepened often by a manly religion" (pp. 3, 4).

Turning then, to the "Clergy in American letters," and opening at the chapter which deals with "Poetry and Romance," we may read such bits of "purely literary analysis" as this: "The clergy have always been fond of the poets, storing up a phrase or a couplet to lend greater beauty and power to the truth which they have set forth. Horace and Milton were read, not only with the interest of the teacher, but because of a message to the imagination, which loosed the play of fancy and created a music within, seeking an outlet in verse. There have been many of the clergy who, in moments of special feeling, or to commemorate important events, to stir up patriotism or to aid in worship, have written lines that bear within them the human emotions of passion, devotion, and reverence" (pp. 84-85).

Again Mr. Addison's discussion of sacred poetry in America may be summarized, in his own words, as follows: "American hymnology has not been thoroughly studied, but enough is known to justify the assertion that this branch of poetry has been largely cultivated among the clergy of all denominations. . . . The genuinely famous hymns, those that have found their way into other lands, are not numerous, but they are the flower of American hymnology. As literature they have a vital quality about them which gives them a much greater influence than many a longer and more ambitious poem. . . . Among the hymns that are used by churches everywhere are 'My faith looks up to Thee,' by Ray Palmer; 'Stand up, stand up for Jesus,' by George Duffield; 'I would not live alway,' by William Augustus Muhlenberg; George Washington Doane's 'Softly now the light of day' and 'Fling out the banner;' John Leland's 'The day is past and gone;' 'Lord, lead the way the Saviour went,' of William Croswell; Edmund Hamilton Sears's 'Calm on the listening ear of night;' and 'My Country, 'tis of thee,' and 'The morning light is breaking,' by Samuel Francis Smith" (pp. 96-99).

Finally, one or two of Mr. Addison's comments on the late Bishop of Massachusetts, whom he holds in tender and saint-like reverence, will fairly typify his sketches of individual character: "He was the ideal minister of the American gospel, for he gathered into himself the best elements of American manhood, he had the deepest faith in American institutions, he had the energy, the large vision, the persistent hope of the young nation dealing with its problems of government, education, and character. And he was peculiarly the preacher of a Gospel" (p. 341).

"The life of Phillips Brooks in its varied aspect was that of a stalwart American citizen who won the affection and appreciation of his generation by the earnestness of his life as a tolerant and inspiring leader in all things that make for the best interests of a nation. He was a preacher, but he was also a marked personality, who impressed himself upon the time, and will ever be remembered as a representative American to whom men will gladly refer, when they try to point out the possibilities of American manhood" (p. 384).

Mr. Addison, in fact, has read diligently; he has taken copious notes; and he has not found time to think them into their mutual relations, to phrase them pleasantly, or to infuse into them any suggestions of value. The index, which fills fourteen pages, seems distinctly more careful than the book.

BARRETT WENDELL.

Essays on the Monetary History of the United States. By CHARLES J. BULLOCK, PH.D. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Pp. x, 292.)

THIS little volume, belonging to the "Citizen's Library of Economics, Politics and Sociology," consists of three essays entitled "Three Centuries of Cheap Money in the United States;" "The Paper Currency of North Carolina;" and "The Paper Currency of New Hampshire." A critic might possibly quarrel with its inclusion in a series of volumes of so general an interest as implied by the library title, and at least might fairly challenge the shorter title on the cover, "Monetary History of the United States," as misleading. This, however, is a question for the editor and publishers to settle, for the author is conscientiously careful to indicate that the essays are simply contributions to the monetary and financial history of the United States collected in the preparation of lectures. The essays for the topics covered are thorough and well done. The author's general thesis is that the movements in this country in favor of cheap money, from the earliest period of colonization down to the most recent manifestations, have been chiefly due to the constant spread of settlement westward over large areas that have long remained thinly populated. The inflationist movement finds its strength in the sparsely settled regions where the scarcity of capital is experienced most keenly. In support of this proposition there is the more general essay, the first of those mentioned above, which includes a survey of wampum and barter currency, the silver and gold and paper currencies of the colonies, Continental paper money, the state banks of issue, the treasury notes of the Civil War period, and the more recent agitation for an increase of silver coinage. The author then proceeds to test his thesis by a detailed investigation of the currency experience of two colonies, one in the south, North Carolina, the other in the north, New Hampshire.

The proposition is not a new one, as the author admits; it has been dwelt upon by Professor Sumner; but Professor Bullock, although he

does not overwork the theory, keeps it prominently to the front so that at every stage of the evolution a clear picture is set forth.

The first essay is of special interest. In writing of Continental money, the author clearly shows that Congress was not mainly responsible for the monetary demoralization of the period, for the several states had set the pace and Congress was practically forced to accept the prevailing sentiment of its constituents. It was no time for that assemblage to educate its constituents to more accurate economic thinking. The author accepts the conclusion that Congress was not given the right to issue legal-tender money under the Constitution, and supports his conclusions by the researches of Mr. Libby, which show that the adoption of the Constitution was most keenly opposed in the several states where the very elements which were in favor of paper money issues were strongest. Mr. Bullock has apparently a poor opinion of the work of the state banks of issue before the Civil War, and it may fairly be questioned whether he gives sufficient credit to these institutions, particularly to those established in the East during the period 1840-1860. The author does not include in his general survey any essay on the issues of government paper money for the period 1812-1857. In the treatment of the agitation for silver legislation, Mr. Bullock believes that the Sherman Act was pushed through Congress as a price for tariff support from the West, and in this follows the account given by Senator Teller in his speech of April 29, 1896.

The two essays on the colonial issues of New Hampshire and North Carolina are of less general interest, though of great value to the special investigator. Throughout the work there is a wealth of notes and references, and the mark of the scholar is on every page. The studies are "original" in the truest sense of the term.

While in general agreement with the thesis advocated by the author, I am inclined to believe that a sufficient allowance has not been granted to other influences which led the American people to the adoption of inflation theories. In particular, reference might be made to the abstract political philosophy which has taken possession of large sections of our population at one time and another, which has led to the conclusion that a democratic people is sovereign not only in political activities, but even in attaining economic results. There has been a conviction, and an honest conviction, that value could be created by legislation, a theory which I believe has had close relationship to the theory of the sovereign rights of man. The author, it appears to me, insists too much upon the desire of people to escape their just obligations, and does not take into account sufficiently the superficial philosophy which has been current.

DAVIS RICH DEWEY.

Stage-Coach and Tavern Days. By ALICE MORSE EARLE. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Pp. xvi, 449.)

IN her adopted field, which has become her own, Mrs. Earle renews the life of our early centuries. Through her sparkling narrative and by

the collateral aids of pencil and camera, the slow-moving life of the colonies is set forth and brought along into the bustling times of the nineteenth century.

In New England, the Puritan "ordinary" became at once an important function in the activities of the rising communities. As indicated (p. 20) every person as well as all material substance was economized and used then. Widows served well in caring for travellers and thus released male citizens for other work, where petticoats would have been a greater hindrance. By the close of the seventeenth century (p. 30) this word "ordinary" was dropped and tavern became the name of the social centres in the colonies. It is assumed generally that inn was the English denomination of this place and social function, as against tavern in trans-Atlantic use. But Shakspeare, if we exclude inns in the legal sense, uses the word tavern nearly twice as often as he uses inn.

The book shows clearly—what impresses every reader of our early history—that the tavern was the main spring of our early social life, wherever it ran outside the churches, and the landlord was the protagonist. The modern club, exchange, auction room, board of trade, or journalistic centre—all these had their germs in the tap-room of the Blue Anchor, Green Dragon, or Merchant's Coffee House of olden time. Ships' cargoes, lands, houses, negroes, merchandise of all sorts were negotiated, traded, or vendued in these cheery old taverns. The captain of these industries, the lord of this unsurveyed and unmeasured land was "if not the greatest man in town certainly the best known and ever the most picturesque and cheerful figure" (p. 62). John Dunton hardly exaggerated when he sketched the delightful portrait of George Monk, presiding host at the Blue Anchor, Boston, 1686. John Adams gives a most significant picture of tavern life (p. 172) in 1772. Unknown, he sat by a bar-room fire in Shrewsbury. "There presently came in, one after another, half a dozen, or half a score substantial yeomen of the neighborhood, who sitting down to the fire after lighting their pipes, began a lively conversation on politics." He reports the substance of their talk, which embodied the issues of the coming revolution as well as John or Samuel Adams could do it. Farmers like these, soon "embattled" at Concord and Lexington, spoke their opinions through the old muskets of the French and Indian wars.

The attack on the British cruiser *Gaspee* in Narragansett Bay—the first overt act of the American Revolution—was planned by John Brown and his *confrères* in a Providence tavern on South Main Street. If we would see how they were used in the opposite direction by royal agents and press-gangs, read the accounts (p. 191) of a Norfolk tavern. On the walls of these old tap-rooms were spread couplets conveying many homely truths (p. 45):

"I've trusted many to my sorrow.
Pay today. I'll trust tomorrow."

In 1824 Lafayette's companions found fifty taverns as good as Bispham's at Trenton, N. J. (p. 83). The accommodation was as good

as at English provincial inns and the food was better. In the same period the City Hotel kept by two old bachelors (p. 37) in New York City was a famous hostelry. It was said that Willard never went to bed, but "performed his parts of host, clerk, book-keeper and cashier." Certainly he attended to his business literally; for when he was called out on the great occasion that opened Niblo's Garden, it was found that he had not owned a hat for years.

Coaching [by stage was fairly established about the middle of the eighteenth century. In 1718 (p. 260) Wardwell ran a line from Boston to Rhode Island, now Newport. The first carriages were an extension of a carryall, with seats across, somewhat like the present Concord wagon. The stage-coach proper, developed from the English models, was perfected at Concord, N. H., in 1827. These coaches have gone over the whole world. This method of travel was very romantic and the old driver was hardly inferior to the landlord of the tavern as a social agent.

Our author gives proper emphasis (p. 245) to the evolution of the Conestoga wagon, prairie schooner, army transport, from the days of Braddock's march to its entry into San Francisco. It has embarked at the Golden Gate and probably it will occupy the Philippines, for it is a vehicle of civilization.

The book is the most interesting of Mrs. Earle's writings; but it is not the best arranged. It shows haste and a lack of proportion, the inferior parts crowding and jostling the better portions. There is some confusion in the treatment of different sections of the country, and by confounding periods of time. If pictures are to illustrate and not carry the text, why is there a modern house (p. 23) like Buckman's Tavern, to set forth the Puritan ordinary in its earliest days? The matter being redundant, the text loses by complication of facts drawn from English history. An extended account of life and movement, in tavern and coach, should not be dumped (p. 434) into a graveyard and end abruptly in an epitaph.

But these are minor criticisms. The matter affords important illustrations of history, and the treatment is interesting. The gossiping style accords with the subject in hand, and the author's patient industry sufficiently guarantees the numerous facts. The book is amply illustrated, beautifully printed, and mounted on clumsy paper.

WILLIAM B. WEEDEN.

The Referendum in America, together with some Chapters on the History of the Initiative, and other Phases of Popular Government in the United States. By ELLIS PAXSON OBERHOLTZER, Ph.D. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. x, 430.)

So many of the books on public questions at the present day are written to advocate some particular reform, rather than to set forth the observed facts of political evolution; so many of the authors ought to be classed as political pamphleteers, rather than as students of the science

of government ; that it is refreshing to take up a work like Mr. Oberholtzer's, which aims, not at urging a panacea, but at describing the progress actually made by a novel institution. Novel it may fairly be called, although the use of the popular vote in legislation is by no means new in America. It may be traced to the first adoption of state constitutions in the eighteenth century, and has undergone, as the author points out, a steady and normal development quite apart from foreign influences ; yet the movement has received a great impetus of late years by a conscious imitation of Swiss examples. For this very reason Mr. Oberholtzer's book, while in one sense a new edition of his monograph published in 1893, contains a great deal that has occurred in the interval, and has, in fact, as he tells us, been entirely rewritten.

The first two chapters are devoted to a study of the struggle in the state of Pennsylvania between the French conception of democracy embodied in a single chamber, which was advocated by Franklin, and John Adams's ideas of popular government limited by checks and balances. The story as told is both interesting and in itself valuable, and we should be sorry not to have it, but one must admit that its relation to the rest of the book is not very close.

In the third chapter the author enters upon his real subject, with an account of the extension of the functions of the state constitutional convention at the expense of the legislature. He next proceeds to describe the submission of constitutions for ratification to popular vote, a practice which, after having become to all appearance a universal and settled custom, was discarded by the Southern states, first during the period of secession and reconstruction, and again during the last few years for the purpose mainly of disfranchising the negroes.

Mr. Oberholtzer follows with careful discrimination the operation of the popular vote in the amendment of constitutions, and then traces its use in general legislation of various kinds up to the complete adoption of the Referendum and Initiative in the Swiss form by South Dakota, in 1898. He points out that while the practice of giving the legislature constitutional authority to submit laws to the people of the state has increased, the courts have tended to decide that without such authority the submission cannot be made. On the other hand the courts have tended no less strongly to uphold the right of the legislature without constitutional permission, to make the local application of a law depend upon the vote of the people of the locality. Although the opinions of the judges are not always clear or consistent, the real legal reason for this distinction is simple. The objection to a general Referendum without constitutional sanction is based on the principle that the legislature has no right to delegate to anyone else the powers entrusted to it ; but it is always authorized, specifically or by implication, to delegate local government to local bodies, and it is as well justified in making the delegation to the people of a town as to the mayor or council.

The instances of the submission of local matters, or the local application of general laws, to local popular vote, are manifold, and Mr.

Oberholtzer reviews them very fully, devoting more than one-third of the book to different phases of the subject. The matters in regard to which such a vote is taken are of endless variety, but the author makes it appear very clearly that, until the recent imitation of Swiss methods, the Referendum, both general and local, (and for that matter the Initiative as well) was confined to definite questions determined beforehand by law.

In his chapter on the Initiative, Mr. Oberholtzer points out the curious fact that it has been found necessary, especially in the case of efforts to change the county seat, to restrain the use of the Initiative by allowing petitions for the purpose to be presented only at long intervals, by requiring a large number of signers, and by insisting on a guarantee against pecuniary loss to the community.

This remark leads naturally to the only general criticism—if it be a criticism—that we have to make on the book. The work is devoted to a study of the legal provisions for the Referendum, and tells us little of its actual results. The author does indeed point out the smallness of the vote cast, and the common tendency of the people to vote for or against all the questions presented at one time without discriminating much between them. But except for this, there are only scattered references here and there to particular votes, with nothing in the nature of an attempt to collect or tabulate the results. The Referendum and the Initiative in the Swiss form have, indeed, been adopted here too recently to make their use of any consequence as yet, but in the native form, which Mr. Oberholtzer thinks decidedly the best suited to our condition, the Referendum has existed for a long time, and a general collection of statistics concerning its effects might be highly valuable. Perhaps he may at some time in the future complete his subject by doing this work. If so, he may feel assured that we shall be even more grateful to him than we are today.

A. LAWRENCE LOWELL.

English Common Law in the Early American Colonies. By PAUL SAMUEL REINSCH, Ph.D., LL.B., Assistant Professor of Political Science in the University of Wisconsin. (University of Wisconsin. 1899. Pp. 64.)

THE ordinary theory of the courts regarding the beginnings of the common law in America is, of course, that the early settlers brought it with them as a birthright (so far as applicable to their conditions) and looked upon it from the first as a positive system wherever not replaced by colonial enactment. Such a statement, Dr. Reinsch rightfully contends, is historically incomplete and inaccurate. The points he urges in modification may be summed up as follows: (1) When the early settlers did refer to their inheritance in the common law, they had in mind only certain, general principles of personal liberty, not the highly complex and technical English system; (2) in New England in particular there was a considerable period in which the common law was not consciously re-

garded as binding, and in which indeed it was sometimes consciously rejected; (3) even in the other colonies there existed at first a rude, untechnical, popular law—the child of American conditions, departing widely from the English common law in fact and indifferent to it in theory; (4) it was at a later date, toward the end of the seventeenth century, that the growth of trained lawyers and the pressure from the mother-country brought about the recognition of the English system—which continued, however, to be affected vitally by the earlier American popular law. These positions are justified by an examination into the legal ideas and practice of the early settlers, colony by colony, from north to south.

The criticism is sound; and historians and jurists alike are under obligations to Dr. Reinsch for emphasizing it. It is the more a matter of regret that the monograph is marred by many blemishes. Only a few can be noted here. The author tends to exaggerate his points. There is much repetition within small compass, where greater detail instead would be acceptable. The geographical order of investigation fails to justify itself. There is a curious determination to find “reversions” (on pages 5, 8, 19, 33, 37, 46, and 55, out of fifty-five pages of text): none of these are very clear, and many clearly are not reversions. Thus the union of powers in colonial councils (p. 33) is certainly not an *American* reversion; the courts of justices in Virginia (p. 46) were not a “reversion to the very archaic type of Doomsmen of the Anglo-Saxon courts,” but a remarkably good copy of an existing English institution; the practice of attainting juries (pp. 19 and 56) was not a “reversion” to an “archaic” custom, but a natural continuance in America of a practice just dying out in England.

Other misstatements abound. The idea that unification of legal principles (p. 9) was in any way due to a growth of national feeling before the Revolution seems an unjustifiable assumption. That magistrates heard cases involving small sums without a jury (p. 13) and that men were fined for “seditious” speech (p. 15) are rather illustrations of the influence of contemporary English practice than the contrary. The Massachusetts *Body of Liberties* (of 1641) could hardly have “re-enacted” (p. 13) a clause of the “fundamentals” (?) of 1646. It is hardly fair to assure us twice that the men of Massachusetts regarded Magna Charta as the “embodiment of the common law” (p. 21) on the authority of a document which has only nine references to Magna Charta and twenty-nine to other “Common Lawes of England.” It is impossible to close without regretting the author’s frequent dependence upon secondary authorities in a treatise which has for its express purpose to combat vague views accepted on just such a basis. The close following of Campbell’s *History* (p. 46) on the Virginian courts is particularly unfortunate—especially in the statement that the “General Court” grew up by custom, seeing that this court was instituted by the earliest charters, and that its appellate jurisdiction (probably the matter in question) was expressly reserved when the county courts were originally established.

W. M. WEST.

The American Slave-Trade: An Account of its Origin, Growth and Suppression. By JOHN R. SPEARS. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900. Pp. xvi, 232.)

FOR the general reader this book may have some interest. To the student of the slave-trade, in its origin, growth, or suppression, it offers nothing of value, in source-material, method, spirit or conclusions.

The work has no bibliography and no index. It possesses five footnote references, and occasional allusions to sources are scattered through the text. The preface states that the book was written "almost wholly from public documents, biographies, stories of travellers, and other sources of original information." Examination shows that G. Williams's *The Liverpool Privateers*, a work on the English and not the American trade, is drawn upon for statistical and other information, occasionally erroneous; that on the earlier period of the trade the author is indebted for the "documents" cited to Mr. G. C. Mason's article in the *American Historical Record* of July and August, 1872: and that on conditions in Africa, the "middle passage" and the profits of the trade, he apparently makes no distinction between "stories of travellers" on the American and on the English trade.

The author's reiteration of the immorality of the traffic is more pronounced than any search for underlying causes on which it was built. "The assertion that the British forced the traffic on unwilling colonists in America," says Mr. Spears, "is a puling whine," for the latter did not "virtuously" struggle to resist it. Such treatment disposes of early attempts at restrictive legislation in short order, but it also leaves cause and effect largely untouched.

The salient features in the trade—negroes in Africa, captures, middle passage, profits, losses, domestic slave-trade, smuggling, restrictive legislation,—are too frequently touched upon in an illusory manner. For example, under the caption, "The Proportion of Disastrous Voyages," it is said that "something may be told of the proportion of losing to paying voyages." A citation follows from an insurance policy, showing the nature of the risks, and this statement: "For assuming these risks the underwriters charged usually £20 in a hundred, but Mr. William Johnson got at least one policy of a hundred for £18 premium." This is all we learn of the "proportion of losing to paying voyages" in the American slave-trade. Again, we are told that "no trade ever paid such large returns on the investments." In the chapter "The Slavers' Profit" eleven cases are cited, figures given on ten, all showing enormous profits. Six of these cases are taken from Williams's book, mentioned above, and are ships in the English trade. Two more are evidently trading between Cuba and Africa. Our exact information on the profits of vessels in the American slave-trade is thereby cut down to two cases.

The author's unfamiliarity with primary sources leads him into occasional errors. There never was a "Royal Assiento" Company. Consequently the African Company of 1662 could not have sold out to it,

(pp. 15-16). The failure of the Company of Royal Adventurers was due to the Dutch War, not to "interloping," ships. The consequences of interloping are correctly apprehended, but they cannot be assigned to this date, (pp. 15-16). The contracts to furnish 3,000 slaves a year were not with the British West Indies (p. 15), but with certain Spaniards, for the Spanish trade. The "new company" (p. 16) was the Royal African Company. But it was not "chartered" to monopolize the slave-trade under the famous Assiento contract with Spain," (pp. 95, 96), for that contract was not made until forty-one years after the company was chartered. As regards the Assiento, it cannot be true that "only the Royal Company was named in the agreement," (p. 17), for no specific company was named in it at all. When it was awarded it went to the South Sea Company. It could hardly be that under it "all British traders were to participate in the trade," (p. 17), for the South Sea Company contracted with one concern alone for the entire 4,800 slaves annually, to be delivered in specified numbers, at stated times, at certain places on the African coast. Such instances of carelessness do not establish confidence in any of the author's unsupported statements.

The chapter "On the Slave Coast" bears no resemblance to such work as L. Peytraud's corresponding chapter in *L'Esclavage aux Antilles Françaises*. On the growth of the trade there is no tabulation, and no classified or chronological treatment to adequately represent its development, such as Williams appended to his book. As to the volume of the traffic there is no accurate statement. As to the distribution of the slaves in America nothing is said. We find no sufficient analysis of the causes of mortality in the middle passage, no computation of its amount. These might properly find a place in a "history of the American slave-trade." On its suppression one wonders that the author wrote at all, having before him the excellent work of one whom he calls "the distinguished historian of the negro race."

EDWARD D. COLLINS.

A Century of American Diplomacy. By JOHN W. FOSTER. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1901. Pp. xiii, 497.)

THIS work is the outgrowth of a series of lectures delivered by the author in the School of Diplomacy of the Columbian University. It is a review of the foreign relations of the United States from 1776 to 1876. The book is divided into twelve chapters and the treatment is chronological with the exception of the last chapter which deals with the Monroe Doctrine.

In the field of diplomatic history the limitations of the chronological method are at once apparent, but Mr. Foster has performed the task which he undertook with a high degree of success. He has produced a very readable book and one which will give many Americans a higher opinion than they at present entertain of the achievements of our diplo-

matic service. The narrative is enlivened by incident, anecdote, and character sketch, but it may be questioned whether the author has not sinned in this respect. Surely such subjects as Jefferson's relations with Freneau, Clay's duel with John Randolph, and President Jackson's efforts to make good the social standing of Mrs. Eaton, might have been dismissed with a word, if indeed the author deemed it necessary to introduce them at all. It may be further questioned whether it is wise to recall at such length the bickerings and mutual suspicions that marred the relations of Franklin, Adams, and Jay during their residence at Paris while negotiating the treaty of 1783.

The judicious temper which the author maintains in his judgments of foreign nations is unfortunately abandoned in some of his estimates of his own countrymen. His antipathy to Jefferson is especially noticeable. The chapter on Jefferson's administration is devoted largely to the Louisiana purchase and to difficulties with the diplomatic corps arising out of the extreme simplicity of the official and social customs introduced by him, but in the chapter on the administrations of Washington and Adams there is a truly remarkable array of quotations reflecting upon Jefferson which apparently have nothing else to commend them to our attention.

The administration of the State Department by Mr. Marcy, who receives scant justice at the hands of some historians, is placed in its true light. The author points out what has been frequently overlooked, that the "Ostend Manifesto," which was the work of Mr. Soulé, was repudiated by Marcy, and as a result Soulé's resignation was offered and accepted. The chapter on the diplomacy of the Civil War, when our relations with England were in so delicate a position, is probably the most interesting as well as the best written.

Of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty Mr. Foster says: "The treaty marks the most serious mistake in our diplomatic history, and is the single instance, since its announcement in 1823, of a tacit disavowal or disregard of the Monroe Doctrine, by the admission of Great Britain to an equal participation in the protection and control of a great American enterprise." In this connection the author takes great liberties with the views of Dr. Francis Wharton. On page 458 he quotes from the *Digest* a passage too long to reproduce here, which, detached from its surroundings, seems to substantiate the opinion just cited. As a matter of fact Wharton held just the opposite view, and in immediate connection with the passage quoted by Mr. Foster refers to the section where that view may be found. On page 243 of Vol. II. Wharton has this to say of the neutralization of the canal as provided for in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty: "Such an international agreement, entered into by all the great powers, would not be in conflict with the Monroe doctrine in the sense above given. For an agreement that no powers whatever should be permitted to invade the neutrality of an Isthmus route, but that it should be absolutely neutralized so as to protect it from all foreign assailants by whom its freedom should be imperiled, is an application, not a contravention,

of the Monroe Doctrine. Such an agreement is not an approval of, but an exclusion of, foreign interposition."

The author endorses President Cleveland's interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine in strong terms, and expresses the opinion that "since the action of Congress on President Cleveland's Venezuelan message, it can no longer be contended that Congress has not formally given its approval to the doctrine, and that too, as the opponents of its latest application admit, in its most extreme form. It stands to-day as a cardinal policy of our government."

The book seems to have been written from primary sources and the quotations have been made with great care and accuracy. It is remarkably free from typographical errors and in form and appearance is admirable.

JOHN HOLLADAY LATANÉ.

Paul Jones, Founder of the American Navy. A History. By AUGUSTUS C. BUELL. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Two volumes, pp. 328, 373.)

THE life of Paul Jones has been written many times. Incidents in his career have formed the subjects for several thrilling romances, and he is made the hero in many such works of fiction. Some of these later works on his life have evidently been prepared with paste brush and scissors, while others have without doubt been compiled from the more important English publications on the subject.

The present work under review shows most careful and painstaking research. Mr. Buell has drawn largely from original material, most of which has not previously been used by other writers. He has not only consulted the various printed collections but has had access to the archives of the United States, of France, and of Russia where much relating to this naval hero is deposited and where few have the courage or desire to resort; and the result, for completeness of research, leaves little to be done by future writers on the life of Paul Jones.

There have been few men who have had such a remarkable career or who have touched life at more points than Paul Jones. "Sailor at twelve, mate at seventeen, captain at twenty in the merchant service of the North Atlantic; slave-trader, East Indiaman, and Virginia planter—all before he had passed the age of twenty-six, naval-lieutenant at twenty-eight, captain at twenty-nine, and commodore at thirty-two; at thirty-three the ocean hero of the old world and the new, a knight of France, the most famous sea victor of his time, patronized by kings, petted by duchesses of the blood royal, thanked by Congress, and more than all else, the trusted friend and valued associate of Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Lafayette, Hamilton and Morris; at thirty-six, selected as special envoy to the most aristocratic of courts, charged with the most delicate, difficult and intricate of missions—adjudicator and collector of international claims, without any guide of precedent or any commonly

recognized code of procedure ; at forty, voted a gold medal by Congress, at forty-one, a vice-admiral in the navy of an empire ; at forty-three a prominent figure in the overture of that tremendous drama, the French Revolution—and dead at forty-five.”

In acting as the biographer of a man whose career runs such a gamut Mr. Buell has not been able to conceal or hold in check his admiration for this distinguished naval officer and he speaks for Jones as though he had the knowledge of all the reasons and impulses that governed or influenced him in most of his acts and on many of which Jones himself is silent. This is a most natural consequence in biographical writing, but the determination with which they are expressed warrants a clearer statement of the facts on which they are founded.

The title to the work, *Paul Jones, Founder of the American Navy*, is open to criticism. In what sense was Paul Jones the founder of the American navy? To be sure at the request of his most intimate friend, Joseph Hewes of the Continental Congress, a member of the Naval Committee of June 14, 1775, he was invited to express his views on the kind of ships necessary for the first squadron to be placed in commission by the United Colonies, and later at the request of this committee, and largely through the influence of Mr. Hewes, he labored diligently, examining vessels, supervising alterations and determining armament, and his labors no doubt were of the greatest aid in getting this hurriedly equipped squadron to sea. He never held any active official position in relation to the navy until the middle of December, 1775, when he was commissioned a first lieutenant, the sixth on the list of commissioned officers. If he had been regarded at the time as the one to whom, more than any one else, was due the credit of organizing this squadron, would he not in consequence thereof have been entrusted with its command or would he not have been honored with a higher rank? At any rate if to Jones is to be given the title of “Founder of the American Navy” it must rest upon a more substantial foundation than the title-page to a book, and the absence of foot-notes in the first six chapters leaves the reader in the dark regarding the authorities on which the author relies to substantiate this claim.

Mr. Buell handles with rare delicacy and tenderness that portion of his private life which is open to criticism and his conclusions seem warranted by the little that is known of the actual relation between him and Aimée de Telison. Much would have been added to the value of his work if the author could have pursued his researches to the extent of locating the burial place of this naval hero. The two volumes are written in a style that commands interest and which is sustained until the end.

EDWARD FIELD.

American History told by Contemporaries. Edited by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, Professor of History in Harvard University. Vol. III. National Expansion, 1783–1845. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. xx, 668.)

ONE of Dr. Hart's pieces is Sydney Smith's well-known diatribe in the *Edinburgh Review*, in which he asks the famous question as to who

reads an American book. His contempt for what had been written in America was natural from his point of view, and not without justification. Little of what is printed in this book is of high literary merit. Yet one cannot examine it carefully without being impressed by the thought how much that was instructive and entertaining the Americans wrote in the first sixty years after the acknowledgment of their independence. However it might appear in London, an observer from Mars, admitting that the inhabitants of this quarter of the globe had little of the refinements of literary cultivation indeed (if the Martian standards are like those of the best of this planet), would nevertheless have said that they had good stuff in them and were bound to accomplish great things.

Dr. Hart has ranged, with evident gusto, over this large mass of writings, and has made an excellent selection of characteristic and entertaining pieces, choosing on much the same principles as governed the composition of his previous volumes. Collections of official documents, writings of public men, diaries and private correspondence, memoir-writers, essayists, travellers and writers of verse, have been drawn upon in rich variety. The compiler's chief object has been to exhibit the complexion of past times, the political and social conditions of American life, rather than to set forth particular events, however striking. Narratives of the events of political history are accordingly not numerous. There are hardly more than a dozen. The chief of them are Nathan Dane's account of the drafting of the Ordinances for the Northwest Territory, M. Otto's account of the Annapolis Convention, a letter of General Lincoln respecting Shays's Rebellion, Madison's description of the closing scenes in the Philadelphia Convention, "Laco's" bitter statement of the manner in which Hancock supported the Constitution in the Massachusetts Convention, selections from the narrative portion of the X. Y. Z. Correspondence, and Lucien Bonaparte's vivid and malicious account of the scene between Napoleon, Joseph and himself over the cession of Louisiana. The much more numerous pieces illustrating social and political questions are similarly well-chosen; but it is difficult to describe them by anything much shorter than a table of contents. We think there might well have been more than one selection from Tocqueville. A more serious criticism might be based upon the lack of pieces illustrating the character and condition of the Southwest. The author is abundantly alive to the importance of the West in his scheme, but it is practically the Northwest alone which is in his mind's eye. Now south of the Ohio and west of Georgia there dwell to-day nearly as many millions as north of the Ohio and west of Pennsylvania. They have been the Boeotians of our history. We have not heard much about them. Yet their development is well worth recounting, for they constitute one of our great types and embrace something near a quarter of our population.

We dwell upon this thought because it is distinctly the habit of historical scholars, more especially of Northern historical scholars, not to consider the western expansion of this portion of our population in any-

thing like the same way as that in which they view the western expansion of the North. This may be clearly seen in Dr. Hart's treatment of the annexation of Texas. It is made a sub-section under "Slavery and Abolition." It was natural that a former generation should see the episode in this guise; but must we not now see that the relation of the annexation of Texas to the extinction of slavery is only one-half of the Texan story? No one can read the narratives of the earlier Texans, such for instance as are constantly appearing in the *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association, without perceiving that, in the main, the Republic of Texas stands on the same basis as the short-lived republics of West Florida, California and Hawaii, and that the movement toward the occupation of that country is, independently of slavery, a wholly natural and very interesting part of the great epic of American expansion. A few pieces exhibiting Southwestern development would help to make all this clear to the youthful mind.

It is probably right, though it is certainly disagreeable, to mention some small defects in the practical introduction which is prefixed to this excellent book. P. 2, Bancroft's *Constitution* "reprinted with documents as a sixth volume," etc., should of course be "reprinted without the documents." It is a great pity that in the bibliography and in the text the edition of Jefferson's writings cited should be the old one by Professor Washington and not the new one by Mr. Paul Ford. One cannot complain so much that W. C. Ford's *Washington* is ignored in favor of Sparks's. It is not enormously better. But the earlier edition of Jefferson was distinctly bad; and the student surely ought rather to be referred to Mr. Ford's admirable collection. One does not know what to make of the characterization of Maclay's *Journal* as "the most valuable periodical journal of the period" (p. 10). Indeed, we must think it a mistake to give so much prominence to Maclay in so brief a bibliography (pp. 10, 12), and to give two long pieces from him in the text, without declaring emphatically the reserves with which his opinions must be taken. Maclay was a contemptible creature if there ever was one, and if we are forced, because the other senators did not keep diaries, or their descendants have failed to produce them, to see things through his jaundiced eyes, the young among us are entitled to a warning, to account for the strange colors they see.

A History of Political Parties in the United States. By J. P. GORDY, PH.D. In four volumes. Vol. I. (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1900. Pp. 598.)

Political Parties in the United States, 1846-1861. By JESSE MACY, A.M., LL.D. [The Citizen's Library.] (New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. viii, 333.)

A History of Political Parties in the United States. By JAMES H. HOPKINS, formerly Representative in Congress from Pennsylvania. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1900. Pp. 477.)

HERE are three books with practically the same title and dealing with the same general subject. They are, however, quite unlike, because the writers have set themselves different aims, have adopted different methods of treatment, and have had widely different standards of workmanship. Two of the writers are professors in western colleges; the third is a retired congressman.

I had hoped to find in Mr. Hopkins's book, written as it is by a man who has had the advantage of contact with large affairs, the human touch too often wanting in books about American politics written under academic influences. But his treatise can scarcely be considered a serious contribution to political history. The text is little more than a running account of national elections from the beginning down to the present time, interspersed with brief and unedifying references to well-known events which are supposed to have affected parties and candidates. There is no evidence of research, no illuminating discussion, no skill in arrangement, no charm of narrative. His comments on public men are very much in the style of congressional eulogies. Jefferson, whose departure from Washington in 1809 was anything but triumphal, retired, according to Mr. Hopkins, "crowned with honors and happy in the prosperity of his country." Andrew Jackson's achievement at New Orleans is magnified by doubling the strength of Pakenham's army. It is asserted without qualification that the financial disturbance following Jackson's removal of the deposits was "an artificial panic, started by the brokers and agents of the banks and hostile politicians." Throughout, party platforms and similar utterances are accepted at their face value; there is no attempt whatever to go behind them to determine what parties have actually stood for. An appendix—nearly half the book—gives in full all the platforms adopted by national conventions.

Of Professor Gordy and Professor Macy it may be said that both have taken their subject seriously, both have written candidly and without apparent inclination to arraign or to defend any party organization. Professor Gordy's book is the second edition, somewhat revised, of the first of four volumes in which he proposes to cover the whole field of our political history. It brings the narrative down to the end of Jackson's administration. Treating with much care and in considerable detail the formation of the Constitution, the great constructive measures of the early congresses, and the foreign and international difficulties of the new government, the work is really more than a history of parties. A more accurate title would be "A History of Government in the United States, with Special References to Party Controversies." Professor Macy's narrative is confined to the period from 1846 to 1861; but he gives more space to general discussion, to the philosophy of the subject, than Professor Gordy. Perhaps the latter will in a future volume give us more at length the general views which in his close study of specific controversies he has not, as yet, found occasion fully to set forth.

In truth, however, it is no light undertaking to interpret in any broad way the history of American politics. One finds it easier and safer to

thing like the same way as that in which they view the western expansion of the North. This may be clearly seen in Dr. Hart's treatment of the annexation of Texas. It is made a sub-section under "Slavery and Abolition." It was natural that a former generation should see the episode in this guise; but must we not now see that the relation of the annexation of Texas to the extinction of slavery is only one-half of the Texan story? No one can read the narratives of the earlier Texans, such for instance as are constantly appearing in the *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association, without perceiving that, in the main, the Republic of Texas stands on the same basis as the short-lived republics of West Florida, California and Hawaii, and that the movement toward the occupation of that country is, independently of slavery, a wholly natural and very interesting part of the great epic of American expansion. A few pieces exhibiting Southwestern development would help to make all this clear to the youthful mind.

It is probably right, though it is certainly disagreeable, to mention some small defects in the practical introduction which is prefixed to this excellent book. P. 2, Bancroft's *Constitution* "reprinted with documents as a sixth volume," etc., should of course be "reprinted without the documents." It is a great pity that in the bibliography and in the text the edition of Jefferson's writings cited should be the old one by Professor Washington and not the new one by Mr. Paul Ford. One cannot complain so much that W. C. Ford's *Washington* is ignored in favor of Sparks's. It is not enormously better. But the earlier edition of Jefferson was distinctly bad; and the student surely ought rather to be referred to Mr. Ford's admirable collection. One does not know what to make of the characterization of Maclay's *Journal* as "the most valuable periodical journal of the period" (p. 10). Indeed, we must think it a mistake to give so much prominence to Maclay in so brief a bibliography (pp. 10, 12), and to give two long pieces from him in the text, without declaring emphatically the reserves with which his opinions must be taken. Maclay was a contemptible creature if there ever was one, and if we are forced, because the other senators did not keep diaries, or their descendants have failed to produce them, to see things through his jaundiced eyes, the young among us are entitled to a warning, to account for the strange colors they see.

A History of Political Parties in the United States. By J. P. GORDY, PH.D. In four volumes. Vol. I. (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1900. Pp. 598.)

Political Parties in the United States, 1846-1861. By JESSE MACY, A.M., LL.D. [The Citizen's Library.] (New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. viii, 333.)

A History of Political Parties in the United States. By JAMES H. HOPKINS, formerly Representative in Congress from Pennsylvania. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1900. Pp. 477.)

HERE are three books with practically the same title and dealing with the same general subject. They are, however, quite unlike, because the writers have set themselves different aims, have adopted different methods of treatment, and have had widely different standards of workmanship. Two of the writers are professors in western colleges; the third is a retired congressman.

I had hoped to find in Mr. Hopkins's book, written as it is by a man who has had the advantage of contact with large affairs, the human touch too often wanting in books about American politics written under academic influences. But his treatise can scarcely be considered a serious contribution to political history. The text is little more than a running account of national elections from the beginning down to the present time, interspersed with brief and unedifying references to well-known events which are supposed to have affected parties and candidates. There is no evidence of research, no illuminating discussion, no skill in arrangement, no charm of narrative. His comments on public men are very much in the style of congressional eulogies. Jefferson, whose departure from Washington in 1809 was anything but triumphal, retired, according to Mr. Hopkins, "crowned with honors and happy in the prosperity of his country." Andrew Jackson's achievement at New Orleans is magnified by doubling the strength of Pakenham's army. It is asserted without qualification that the financial disturbance following Jackson's removal of the deposits was "an artificial panic, started by the brokers and agents of the banks and hostile politicians." Throughout, party platforms and similar utterances are accepted at their face value; there is no attempt whatever to go behind them to determine what parties have actually stood for. An appendix—nearly half the book—gives in full all the platforms adopted by national conventions.

Of Professor Gordy and Professor Macy it may be said that both have taken their subject seriously, both have written candidly and without apparent inclination to arraign or to defend any party organization. Professor Gordy's book is the second edition, somewhat revised, of the first of four volumes in which he proposes to cover the whole field of our political history. It brings the narrative down to the end of Jackson's administration. Treating with much care and in considerable detail the formation of the Constitution, the great constructive measures of the early congresses, and the foreign and international difficulties of the new government, the work is really more than a history of parties. A more accurate title would be "A History of Government in the United States, with Special References to Party Controversies." Professor Macy's narrative is confined to the period from 1846 to 1861; but he gives more space to general discussion, to the philosophy of the subject, than Professor Gordy. Perhaps the latter will in a future volume give us more at length the general views which in his close study of specific controversies he has not, as yet, found occasion fully to set forth.

In truth, however, it is no light undertaking to interpret in any broad way the history of American politics. One finds it easier and safer to

It is no doubt true that many of us, having traced events to their causes, rest content with that achievement alone. Things done have too much the effect of finality. One concedes Professor Macy's general contention, but he is not convincing when he tries to point out just how the Whigs could have kept their party alive, drawn to their support both the anti-slavery men of the North and the conservative men of the South, and so saved the Union without war. It *was* the blunders and sins of men, and no mere harsh decree of fate, that cost us so many precious lives. But it was not the blunders and sins of the Whig party alone. We were expiating the follies and crimes of centuries, not those of a decade merely. These had brought about such a state of things, such a binding together of dissimilar civilizations, such antagonisms between sections, such bitterness of feeling, that one looking back no farther than the year 1850 can say with reason that division and war were then clearly inevitable, whether President Taylor lived or died, whether Clay's compromise measures passed or not. In the great Greek tragedies, Fate controls; but Fate, being interpreted, means ancient sin.

Professor Macy's later chapters are notable for the consideration he gives to Stephen A. Douglas. It is too common, now that Lincoln's fame is grown to its full proportions, to dwarf his contemporaries that his stature may seem the greater. A reaction is sure to come. It will not, of course, deprive Lincoln of the first place in the history of his times, but Douglas will certainly have his revenge for the unwise belittling of his career which has been the fashion. To exclude him from the well known "American Statesmen" series, while places were found for Charles Francis Adams and Thaddeus Stevens, was altogether unjust. From the death of Clay until Lincoln was nominated, Douglas's was quite the most important figure on the stage; and the man who thus dominated a notable epoch was not altogether unworthy of the place he then held in the public eye.

I should add that Mr. Hopkins escapes an error into which both Professor Macy and Professor Gordy have fallen. He spells Breckinridge correctly.

WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN.

The Writings of James Monroe. Edited by STANISLAUS MURRAY HAMILTON. Vol. IV., 1803-1806. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1900. Pp. xviii, 509.)

THE conclusion of Mr. Hamilton's fourth volume brings him to the end of the year 1806. Now of the letters of Monroe preserved in the Department of State, which are the chief staple of Mr. Hamilton's collection, somewhat less than four-ninths precede that date and somewhat more than five-ninths are subsequent to it. There is here some ground for apprehension. If continued upon the same scale the collection will amount to nine or ten volumes. We believe that only six were originally promised. Nine or ten such volumes represent a mass of material,

and to the buyer an amount of expense, which to many persons will seem excessive; in proportion to fourteen volumes of Washington, ten volumes of Adams and of Jefferson, nine or ten of Monroe is a large quantity. We should be sorry if a general feeling that this is the case should cause Mr. Hamilton to abridge too much the latter portions of his collection; for it is here that its main interest and importance will surely be found. For the period of our political history extending to 1815 we do not lack material in the shape of official and private correspondence. After 1815 we have comparatively much less, and Mr. Hamilton's chief opportunity to make a notable contribution of new material for American history lies in the eight years of Monroe's presidency. Abridgment would have been more in place in these earlier years. The present volume contains not a few letters of quite trivial importance.

At the same time the book contains much that is useful and interesting, though Monroe's style does not cease to be dull. Here are 112 letters, of which few have ever been printed before. About three-fourths of them come from the collections of Monroe, Madison and Jefferson papers in the Department of State; others from a letter-book possessed by the Library of Congress, from the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, from the private collection of Mrs. James Lyons, etc. The last mentioned are of exceptional interest, being letters of Monroe to John Randolph. The manner in which Monroe meets Randolph's flattering letters, suggesting that he rather than Madison shall be the Republican candidate for the presidency, is admirable. He says (p. 407):

"My own opinion is then, that the idea had better be relinquished:—that by such relinquishment the cause of free government would be more essentially served than by pursuing it. There are older men, whom I have long been accustomed to consider as having higher pretensions to the trust than myself, whose claims it would be painful to me to see rejected; and you will find that I repose an unbounded confidence in your honour and candour when I state to you that the person who seems to be contemplated by others is in that class. It would be impossible to embark in such a controversy without putting in opposition, through the whole community, men who have been long in the habit of dangerous and laborious co-operation in support of that cause;—without harrowing up their feelings and tearing up by the roots antient friendships."

This is in June, 1806. How well Monroe's magnanimity and fortitude would stand the severer test imposed by Jefferson's rejection of his treaty, remains to be shown in the next volume. Much in the present volume shows that he had gained in magnanimity and in balance as well as in diplomatic experience. He is still prone to suspicion and to undue anxiety respecting his personal position; but he understands Europe and his task better. This is partly due to the fact that he is carrying on the task—not very successfully, it must be admitted—in London, where there was no barrier of language in the way of his somewhat slow thought.

Beside letters, Mr. Hamilton prints, widely separated, two fragments of a journal or memorandum respecting the Louisiana negotia-

tions of April, 1803, a formal opinion respecting the question of West Florida, and a note respecting our differences with Spain which Monroe prepared for publication in the *Morning Chronicle* in May, 1806, but which he concluded to suppress.

Students of the history of deaf-mute instruction will find interesting matter in certain letters to John Randolph (pp. 414, 480, 485) who had confided to Monroe's care a deaf-mute nephew.—Many passages which, under the most restricted scheme of annotation, might well have foot-notes, are left unexplained.

Numbers and Losses in the Civil War in America, 1861-65. By THOMAS L. LIVERMORE, Member of the Military Historical Society of Massachusetts. (Boston : Houghton, Mifflin and Company. 1900. Pp. vi, 150.)

COLONEL LIVERMORE, the author, served in the Civil War as major and brevet colonel of the Fifth, and as colonel of the Eighteenth New Hampshire Volunteers, and is well qualified to interpret military records and reports; as a member of the Massachusetts Military Historical Society, he has heretofore devoted attention to the subjects of this volume. After a thorough examination during the last three years, of about all accessible records relating to them, he has embodied his conclusions in this book.

Colonel Livermore aims to establish, upon the best evidence obtainable, the number of men who served during the Civil War in the Confederate army. In this he is unquestionably successful, and the result of the evidence and estimates he produces is incontrovertible.

In the pursuit of evidence, on which to base just conclusions, the author touches on the courage and efficiency of the Union and of the Confederate army; gives the numbers engaged in a list of battles, in each of which the losses were not less than 1,000; compares battles with others corresponding to them; and submits a table of the successes and defeats on both sides of the war, as well as estimates of the losses of the Confederate army.

An official statement of the number of men who served in the Confederate army is not on record. Some Confederate writers have estimated this number to be from 600,000 to 700,000. Only one of these writers attempts to show by figures the correctness of his estimate, and Colonel Livermore by using these figures demonstrates that the highest of Confederate estimates is too low.

A detailed description of Colonel Livermore's methods is impracticable in this place and only some of the main results at which he arrives can be referred to here.

Based on the census of 1860 and the conscription laws of the Confederacy the number of men in its military service is found to have been 1,239,000. Based on the average total strength of regiments, etc., in the Confederate service, including irregular organizations, two figures,

namely—1,227,890 and 1,406,180, are obtained as the number of enrollments made ; the last number Colonel Livermore considers probably too high, and believes that the mean between the two, namely—1,317,035, will come nearer to the actual number of enrollments made.

By converting the terms of service for which men were enrolled, into terms actually served by them, deeming the war to have closed May 4, 1865, without regarding deaths, desertions, etc., and reducing the total of these terms to a standard term of three years, the number of enrollments made in the Union and Confederate armies is found to be equal, respectively, to 1,536,678 and 1,082,119 men who actually served three years.

The number of Confederates who were killed or died of wounds received in action is estimated at 94,000, and those who died of disease at at least 164,000, making a total loss by death of at least 258,000.

Colonel Livermore presents his subject in clear and simple language, and in a soldierly and most impartial manner, and is to be congratulated on his success. His work is of intrinsic value, and will no doubt be accepted by every intelligent survivor of the Civil War, whether Confederate or Union ; there is nothing but honor in its pages for all. The collector of war literature and statistics should and will prize the book highly and the layman will find it interesting and instructive reading.

The Mississippi Valley in the Civil War. By JOHN FISKE. (Boston : Houghton, Mifflin and Co. Pp. xxvi, 368.)

It goes without saying that *The Mississippi Valley in the Civil War*, by John Fiske, is an unusually interesting and readable book. Mr. Fiske could not write a dull book on any subject, and the matters with which he deals in this one, and in his very best manner, might command attentive perusal although treated by the prosiest writers. The book has some minor faults, or what seem to be such in the judgment of those who do not sympathize with the author in the sentiment with which he regards the causes and conduct of the great struggle. Such readers cannot help thinking him at times essentially, although perhaps unconsciously, partizan. Of partizanship in any offensive sense, or to a degree which is positively misleading, no one who is not himself unduly influenced by prejudice will accuse him ; and it is evident that he has striven to be fair in his estimate not only of the events, but of the actors he writes of. Nevertheless he occasionally uses language which, while not appreciably impairing the value of his work as a military treatise, or its historical accuracy, yet does a certain injustice, produces a wrong impression, and reflects on some of the Confederate officers mentioned, in a way that is neither warranted nor generous. It is certainly not fair to style a Confederate cavalry leader a "guerilla," merely because he has performed a special kind of service with more than ordinary enterprise and efficiency. During the war period that term was applied, both in the North and the South, to men who were not soldiers at all, but

bandits and marauders, and a great many people still so understand it. Nor is it at all accurate to liken the operations of the raiding cavalry of the Confederacy to the guerilla warfare at one time conducted in certain countries of Europe. The resemblance, if there be any, is too slight to be considered; and that the term is used as one of reproach is best shown by the fact that Mr. Fiske never employs it in describing similar service performed by the Federal cavalry.

He is guilty of a similar "unjust discrimination," when he characterizes Albert Pike as "an adventurer from Massachusetts." Pike migrated to Arkansas when barely twenty-one years old, and had lived in the South for thirty years when the Civil War began. He was eminent at the bar and in many ways, was a man of high character and social position, and was perfectly convinced of the justice of the cause for which he fought. It may be that the appellation of "rebel" is properly bestowed on all who served the Confederacy, whether born in the North or the South, but there is no more reason to style Albert Pike "an adventurer from Massachusetts," than to term General George H. Thomas an adventurer from Virginia.

So seldom, however, does Mr. Fiske err in this regard and so venial are his lapses from a really impartial account of the events he relates, that we might not observe them if the general tone of his narration were not so free from acrimony and any trace of illiberal temper that the slightest suggestion of such feeling, upon his part, jars us more than bucketsful of abuse from some other war-historians.

While one who has himself seen service in the field may detect in this book evidences of the lack of such experience in its author, it is quite as true that no mere soldier could have written it nearly so well. This is not simply because of the vivid, graphic, picturesque style in which the story is told, and the absence of that dry, technical and unnecessary detail which makes so much of purely military narrative tedious and difficult of appreciative attention, but because of the very lucid and comprehensive method in which the subject matter is presented.

A very large subject, embracing a number of parts having a close but not apparent connection, is treated with a logical arrangement and power of explicit statement which only an unusually acute and incisive writer, accustomed to consider and discuss a great variety of topics, could command. Mr. Fiske's previous studies and work in other departments of literature, were unquestionably of value to him when he undertook the task of military criticism.

The book is a story, as its title imports, of military operations during the Civil War in the states of Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi and Louisiana, conducted in a field stretching from the Ohio and Missouri rivers to the Gulf, and from the Mississippi river to the western prairies, in the one direction, and to the mountains of east Tennessee in the other. It describes the embryonic organization on both sides, and the partially purposeless, totally futile effort put forth by each in the beginning of the conflict. It recites the earlier struggles of raw,

undisciplined troops and untrained commanders, occurring contemporaneously but without any concert or understanding, throughout the vast region wherein, according to the mathesis of war, there should have been intelligent co-operation and linked, sustained endeavor; and it shows how, when finally such intelligent direction and energy was furnished, the overwhelming power of the North broke down the desperate resistance, but feebler resources of the South. Commencing with the abortive attempts of those in sympathy with the South to take Kentucky and Missouri into the Confederacy, and the petty skirmishes which marked incipient hostilities, it concludes with the tremendous battles and vast campaigns which shattered the Confederate strength and prestige in the West.

Mr. Fiske has given an exceedingly clear and comprehensive account of how the superior numbers and material, at all times possessed but not always properly applied by the Federal commanders, were ultimately utilized and rendered effective. The justice of his criticism of some of the commanders, on both sides, and his estimate of the relative importance of some of the minor actions and movements he narrates may, perhaps, be disputed; and his statements regarding the comparative numerical strength of the contending armies in the greater battles—that perennial subject of controversy—will, of course, be challenged. But, in the main, his account is not only explicit and coherent but convincing. There are few who will not agree with him that Halleck's retention in chief command of the Union armies paralyzed their efficiency in the West, and that success became possible only when Grant and his able subordinates were given a free hand.

No writer has so well shown how conducive, indispensable indeed, to Federal success was the service performed by the Federal fleets on the inland waters. But for the aid so rendered in the matter of transportation, and the part taken by the gun-boats in many offensive operations wherein the military and naval efforts were combined, the Union arms would never have completely triumphed in the valley of the Mississippi. Efficient naval co-operation assured the reduction of the forts which guarded the Tennessee and the Cumberland, whose capture forced Albert Sidney Johnston's premature abandonment of the line of the Cumberland and the fertile region of middle Tennessee. It compelled also the evacuation of all the formidable defenses of the upper Mississippi. To Farragut's daring passage of Forts Jackson and St. Philip was solely due the early fall of New Orleans; and the use of the lower Mississippi and the Red river opened the trans-Mississippi to Federal occupation. The army of Rosecrans, cooped up in Chattanooga after the battle of Chickamauga, and the reinforcements brought by Grant to its assistance, would have been compelled to disastrous retreat if supplies had not been furnished by water craft plying the Tennessee river; and the subsequent march to Atlanta and from Atlanta to the sea might have been indefinitely postponed, or have never been made. Undoubtedly the two most interesting chapters of the book are those entitled "The Vicksburg Problem" and "The

Fall of Vicksburg," in which the author describes how Grant sought to wrest from the Confederates control of the two hundred and fifty miles of the Mississippi between Vicksburg and Port Hudson, whereby they maintained communication with their territory west of the great river.

Any narrative of these operations must furnish a remarkable testimonial to the skill, resource and extraordinary tenacity of the great captain, and to the patience and endurance of the troops he commanded ; but the story has never before been told so graphically and with such power as Mr. Fiske tells it, and its interest is greatly enhanced by the description of the part taken by the fleet.

The conditions, especially topographical, under which the war in the West was conducted, permitted and demanded strategic operations on a grand scale to a greater extent than was possible or necessary in the region wherein the armies of the Potomac and Northern Virginia confronted each other. The much smaller area in which these armies operated, and the less number of objective points whose seizure promised strategic advantages, limited their capacity in this regard, and required instead skillful, tactical maneuvering which might enable battle to be delivered at advantage. But in the valley of the Mississippi, penetrated in all directions by navigable streams connecting with each other, traversed centrally by railroad lines affording both means for offensive operations and ready communication over great distances, and full of objective points inviting attack and demanding defense because their capture or loss involved far-reaching consequences—in this vast field, opportunity was offered for the exercise of strategic ability of the highest order. Mr. Fiske has exhibited, in brief compass, but very clearly, this feature of the conflict.

BASIL W. DUKE.

Military Reminiscences of the Civil War. By General JACOB D. COX. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Two vols., pp. xvii, 549 ; xvi, 596.)

FEW if any volumes pertaining to the Civil War equal these in interest. They cover not only the military features of campaigns, but interwoven with these are incidents and the personal and political features attending the movements. The whole flows smoothly on in the scholarly and agreeable style of which General Cox was a master. He had wide experience in the war, having been prominent in the three months' service in West Virginia, in Pope's campaign, in the Antietam, Knoxville, Atlanta, and Nashville campaigns, and, at last, before Wilmington, and in the final operations against Johnston in North Carolina. His was, therefore, a wide field of observation, and his relations to the leading commanders were such as to give him exceptional advantages.

The chapter on the outbreak of the war vividly recalls the rush and the unanimity with which the North, without regard to party, accepted the challenge at Sumter. The details of mobilization at Camp Denni-

son are worthy of study by those writers of our war with Spain who, ignorant of the difficulties of such assembling, drove the nation crazy while our armies were gathering, by attributing conditions which, at the outset, are inseparable from all war camps, to inefficiency and neglect.

The narrative of McClellan's West Virginia campaign is the most satisfactory yet given to the public. It brings into its proper proportions the operations which removed the fighting lines from the northern states, and gave West Virginia to the Union. He justly but temperately criticizes McClellan for leaving Rosecrans to win the battle of Rich Mountain unaided, and claims that on this early theatre of action the same characteristics were noticeable which later became so well known—"The same over-estimate of the enemy, the same tendency to interpret unfavorably the sights and sounds in front, the same hesitancy to throw in his whole force when his subordinate was engaged."

Treating of the comparative merit of the volunteers and regulars General Cox expresses the opinion that, man for man, the volunteers were always better men than the average of those recruited for the regular army and more amenable to discipline. The weakness of the volunteer system was in the officers, but this was soon rectified by a gradual sifting process. He does not accept the dictum that because a young man graduated at West Point he was a good officer, and comes to the conclusion that, before the Civil War, the intellectual education at the Military Academy was essentially the same, as far as it went, as that of any polytechnic school, and that in some of the volunteer regiments were "whole companies of private soldiers who would not have shunned a competitive examination with West Point classes on the studies of the Military Academy, excepting the technical engineering of fortifications."

Reviewing Pope's campaign before Washington he deals fairly with that officer, contends that no one who had any right to judge could question his ability or his zeal, that there was neither intelligence nor consistency in the vituperation with which he was covered. He shows on good authority that the notorious order of Pope from "Headquarters in the saddle," as well as others of that period which at the time were so severely criticized and made the occasion of a bitter and lasting enmity toward Pope on the part of most of the officers and men of the Army of the Potomac, were drafted under the direction of Mr. Stanton, Secretary of War, and given to General Pope to issue, with the idea of infusing vigor into the army, by stirring words which "would by implication condemn McClellan's policy of over-caution in military matters and over-tenderness toward rebel sympathizers and their property."

General Cox was in practical command of the Ninth Corps during the Maryland campaign of September, 1862. His services at South Mountain were brilliant, and at Antietam commendable. His description of the former is full and accurate, that of Antietam is marred by many inaccuracies, especially relating to movements on the Union right. He conclusively controverts the widely and generally accepted belief that Burnside was derelict in duty at Antietam in that he did not attack

and carry the bridge, now known as Burnside Bridge, early in the day. General Cox shows that orders were not given to make the attack until nearly or quite ten o'clock, and that the movement was promptly made. He exonerates Burnside from all blame and puts the responsibility for the failure to destroy Lee's army upon McClellan, who, under malign influences at and near headquarters, had reduced Sumner and Burnside from their proper rank as wing commanders and thrown the army corps into such relation with each other that unity of action was impossible and defeat invited.

The chapter on "McClellan and Politics" is a new and deeply interesting analysis. It is natural that in treating of General Burnside's command of the Department of the Ohio, and the movement into East Tennessee, General Cox, who had prominent part therein, should attempt at much length to defend his chief for not obeying Lincoln's and Stanton's oft-repeated orders to join Rosecrans before the battle of Chickamauga. This effort will not stand the test of the record, especially when it has become known since the war that General "Sam" Jones, who succeeded by his active demonstrations in holding Burnside back, had only 1500 effective men that could easily have been taken care of with two brigades.

In the discussion of the East Tennessee campaign, with which the first volume closes, severe and unwarranted criticisms of General Rosecrans begin, leading up to a version in the second volume of his relief after Chickamauga (related to General Cox by General Garfield, and undoubtedly reported correctly), which will oblige Army of the Cumberland men to tell the full inside history of that affair, which hitherto has been known to a very small circle.

This opening chapter of the second volume is painful reading for the veterans who served under General Rosecrans. Those who know the real facts will feel compelled by this long and specific statement of General Cox to disclose them. But they can only be indicated in this brief review. Stated concisely, they are almost the exact opposite of the present narrative. Instead of General Rosecrans being unnerved and dejected when, after riding clear of the break, the general and his staff halted to consider the situation, he was clear in his orders which he requested General Garfield to give in the immediate rear, and at Chattanooga, while he himself should ride back to Thomas. Garfield persistently argued that these were matters that General Rosecrans, the supreme authority, should properly and more efficiently attend to, while he, Garfield, would ride to Thomas. To this Rosecrans yielded. Garfield's ride was by a detour of eight miles, when the direct road of only two miles was clear of the enemy. Immediately after the battle, and while still chief-of-staff, he wrote Secretary Chase a letter, which has never yet been printed, severely criticizing his chief for going to Chattanooga and otherwise unjustly attacking him. Mr. Chase took the letter to Mr. Lincoln who read it to the Cabinet. It was the direct cause of General Rosecrans's removal. These are the mildest features of the full

story. As to this ride to Thomas, of which much is made, there was no meeting of the enemy except the passing within range of a few cavalry skirmishers, and the exposure of the ride was the merest child's play compared with the fire to which every staff-officer and every soldier on the field was at that moment subjected.

The treatment of General Rosecrans throughout the volumes is generally unfriendly in the extreme, though it consists largely in the repetition of venerable criticisms which are not history. Nor is it worthy treatment of an officer who, up to the time of the break in his lines on the second day at Chickamauga, had never lost a battle, and who unquestionably was the ablest strategist of the war. The old attacks upon this officer for resisting orders to advance before full preparations, first, from Murfreesboro, and next from Winchester, are given the old prominence, without the full vindication of result, which, for the Middle Tennessee campaign, was the driving of Bragg out of the state, over the Cumberland and across the Tennessee river by strategy, with a Union loss of only 570 killed and wounded. For the Chattanooga campaign, the same tactics were repeated on a still larger scale, and Bragg was forced from his mountain stronghold without a battle. Every student of the records knows these facts now, and it is not the part of a fair historian to ignore them.

The chapters on the campaign in East Tennessee are comprehensive and interesting, and constitute in compact form a more complete history than has yet been written.

The initiation of the Atlanta campaign is preceded by an interesting presentation of the relations of General Sherman to his superiors and his subordinates, and the relations between General Johns on and Mr. Davis. General Cox's treatment of the Atlanta campaign keeps entirely out of sight the initial and most serious mistake of General Sherman in not promptly accepting General Thomas's advice to move through Snake Creek Gap, which the latter had found to be unguarded, upon Johnston's rear, and force him to battle. After a three days' delay this was found to be the only practicable move, but it was then too late to prevent the escape of Johnston which compelled the long campaign to Atlanta.

In like manner, the reader receives no impression of the needless and fruitless assault on Kennessaw Mountain, so costly in the loss of life. It is rather treated as a bold stroke called for by the existing conditions.

In spite of the fact that General Grant's map received by General Sherman on April 4, a month before the Atlanta campaign opened, has now been found, and has long been public in the *Atlas* of the War Record Series, which map clearly laid down a March to the Sea after the fall of Atlanta, General Cox, as in his former writings, continues to attribute the origin of this march to General Sherman. As is now well known, General Sherman's plan, which he finally induced General Grant to acquiesce in, differed from that of the latter in leaving Hood in his rear for Thomas to take care of, with an army yet to be assembled, and marching to Savannah with no enemy in his front.

While General Cox's details of Hood's movements against Thomas, culminating in the annihilation of the Confederate army, are full, and presented in most readable form, there is little to indicate the herculean task laid upon Thomas of gathering an army and resisting Hood, who, from May to September had stubbornly retarded Sherman's combined force. This account contains various criticisms upon Thomas's dispositions, and suggestions that this or that movement would have been better. But the destruction of an army is a better criterion by which to judge General Thomas in this campaign than the speculations even of General Cox.

The campaign of General Schofield's army, in which General Cox commanded the Twenty-third Corps, is deeply interesting and a valuable contribution to history. Especially is this true of the closing chapters on the Sherman-Johnston Convention, the surrender, and the disbandment of Johnston's army. Here, however, as in other important matters mentioned, the fact of great consequence to full discussion is not given proper prominence, namely that the first Sherman-Johnston terms, in nearly all their essentials, were written by Mr. Reagan, the Confederate Postmaster-General. This original paper is now in the War Department.

While the work will inevitably excite controversy, each of its fifty-one chapters will be found interesting, and none of them should be overlooked by any student of our war history.

H. V. BOYNTON.

The *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1899* is published in two volumes. The second, consisting of the fourth annual report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, and embracing the Correspondence of John C. Calhoun, will be reviewed in our next number. Vol. I. (Government Printing Office, pp. xii, 871), begins with the usual narrative account of the last annual meeting, (that of Boston and Cambridge, December, 1899), and with the inaugural address of President Rhodes. Of the sixteen papers which follow, seven, like Mr. Rhodes's address, were read at the meeting, and were summarized in that article of the REVIEW for April 1900 in which that meeting was dealt with. These are Professor E. G. Bourne's paper on the Proposed Absorption of Mexico in 1847-1848, that of Dr. W. G. Andrews on a Recent Service of Church History to the Church, Miss Putnam's on Robert Fruin, Professor Robinson's on Sacred and Profane History, that of Professor C. M. Andrews on the question whether recent European history should have a place in the college curriculum, and that of Professor Henry E. Bourne on the Colonial Problem. Nine other papers, read by title only at the meeting, are now printed. Dr. Carl Russell Fish, now of the University of Wisconsin, presents a series of tabular views showing the removals of officials by the President of the United States; Mr. F. H. Miller a careful compilation of the facts respecting legal qualifications for office in America. There is a good investigation of the *droit de banalité* during the French régime in Canada,

by Mr. W. B. Munro; and a long monograph on the career of Captain John Hart as governor of Maryland (1714-1720) by Professor Bernard C. Steiner of the Johns Hopkins University. Mr. Walter F. Prince examines the First Criminal Code of Virginia, chiefly with a view to the question of its authorship. Dr. O. G. Libby offers a critical dissection of Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, the result of which seems to be to deprive it of nearly all value as an independent source. There are also three medieval studies: one by Mr. A. C. Howland, on the Origin of the Local Interdict, one by Mr. Henry L. Cannon, on the Poor Priests and the Rise of English Lollardry, and one by Professor E. W. Dow of the University of Michigan, on Langres in the Early Middle Ages. Two-thirds of the volume are thus composed. Next follows an extensive and well-devised bibliography of the study and teaching of history, by Mr. James I. Wyer, librarian of the University of Nebraska; and a series of titles of books in English history published in 1897 and 1898, selected and annotated by Mr. W. Dawson Johnston. Mr. Thomas M. Owen fills nearly two hundred pages with a comprehensive bibliography of the state of Mississippi, intended as "a catalogue, arranged alphabetically by authors, of books and articles relating to the State of Mississippi, its history, institutions and public characters," and also "to embrace the general literary product of Mississippi writers."

The Letters of Cicero. The whole extant Correspondence in Chronological Order, translated into English by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, M.A. In four volumes. Vols. I.-III. (London, George Bell and Sons, 1899, 1900, pp. xlvii, 387; xviii, 406; xxvii, 381.) We received with pleasure the first announcement that the letters of Cicero were to be translated by a scholar so favorably known as Mr. Shuckburgh. The historian, the literary critic, and the philologist have contributed in recent years so much to the advancement of our knowledge on this subject that it was time that a worthy translation of these letters should be given to the English public. When we remember the high degree of excellence which has characterized many translations produced in the country of Jowett and Jebb, Conington and Munro, we cannot be satisfied with mediocrity in an English version of Cicero's correspondence. In the case of these very letters a high standard has been set in Jean's translation of selected letters and in the happy renderings scattered through the notes of the edition of Tyrrell and Purser. It is, accordingly, with a feeling of real regret that we are compelled to admit that the work before us shows an almost utter disregard of the literary form of the original and often, too, a lack of appreciation of its finer shades of thought. It is asking much of the translator to expect him to render with scrupulous care so large a body of literature, but it is asking much of the reader to expect him to wade through four volumes in which the attention, so far from being sustained by any attractions of style, is even distracted by the awkwardness of the English.

Each volume contains a useful introduction and ample foot-notes. We are glad to see that the author has, as a rule, used English rather

than French in translating the Greek which occurs in these letters. We could wish that he had carried this principle still further and had not introduced into his version so many foreign words and phrases. In the space of three lines (No. 228) we meet with Greek, Latin, and French. We can see no excuse for using a large number of Latin words for which English equivalents are easily found, such as *legatus*, *ordo*, *tribuni aerarii*, etc. It seems inexplicable that one who is so fond of Latin forms should employ such plurals as "Catiuses" and "Amafiniuses" (541). At times we meet with a painfully literal rendering as: "a great rumor" (120), "I was very weighty" (22), "I will bring you a pair of ears" (476), "one's eyes add to the pain" (537), "He will be unwilling that you should, as you would sooner or later, have time to thank for this rather than his favour" (284). At other times the author is very free in his translation and introduces colloquial expressions and slang phrases which are not in harmony with the tone and spirit of the original. Errors in English grammar and in the use of words are not infrequent, and at times there is an incorrect use of tenses which entirely destroys the thought. For example Cicero says in reference to a future event: "If you were to be at Rome, I should have no fear," but this we find translated: "If you were there when this was going on, I should not have been at all afraid" (227). Often the spirit of a passage is lost owing to an apparent lack of appreciation of the special force of individual words which strike the key-note of the thought, as *heros* (22), *gloriolae* (133). When we find in perhaps the most impressive passage of the most perfect letter (554) of the whole collection such a translation as "the corpses of so many towns lie in helpless ruins," we feel that a positive wrong is done Latin literature.

ALBERT GRANGER HARKNESS.

The Story of Assisi, by Lina Duff Gordon. (London, J. M. Dent and Co., 1900, pp. 372.) This book undertakes to do three things: (1) to give an historical sketch of Assisi, (2) to trace the life of St. Francis and the development of his order, (3) to furnish the traveller with a handbook of Assisi's monuments. These aims are nowhere announced in this categorical fashion, but may fairly be said to be involved in the treatment.

With regard to the history of Assisi the author finds that the chief interest lies in the struggles with Perugia. She dismisses the origin of these struggles with a reference to Perugia's "inborn love of fighting" and "to her restless spirit" (p. 19). It is evident without a further word of comment that a writer who contents himself with this simple-minded point of view may save himself much inconvenient trouble, but will not raise the darkness hovering over the Italian commune.

The life of St. Francis and the origin of his order have been treated with such undeniable sympathy and acumen by Paul Sabatier that a reader is justified in demanding an equally successful narrative from every later writer. Sabatier understood that his task was, while making

St. Francis, the *man*, plausible to us by an affectionate study of the early Franciscan documents, yet to follow the successive phases of his order, the *institution*, with historical severity. The life of the saint, as treated in this book, lacks the authentic touch, and the facts of the order are blurred in a general background of circumstances without anything like relief.

By far the greater part of the work is concerned with the third purpose, the creation of a guide to the city's monuments. And here, it may be immediately observed, the author maintains a surer footing, due to her willingness to follow a number of excellent predecessors in this field. Among her authorities she evidently and wisely gives the preference to Mr. Bernhard Berenson, echoes of whose resonant intonation mount from almost every page. A regrettable disfigurement of this portion of the work is furnished by occasional attempts at emotional or rhetorical writing. While it may be granted that for any one who has gazed long at the Umbrian hills, the temptation must be great to produce a new volume of *Sensations d'Italie*, still it is to be insisted that that kind of thing must be superlatively well done to prove acceptable. Such passages as the ascent of Subasio (p. 86) and the youth of Giotto (p. 169) will only be the better for a little pruning; occasional descriptions, however, such as the *perdono d'Assisi* (353 f.) have a real charm.

To sum up, it is fair to say that though the book fails to meet its first two purposes, it constitutes the most valuable guide to Assisi of this compass that is now attainable.

FERDINAND SCHWILL.

Under the title of *Zauberwahn, Inquisition und Hexenprozess im Mittelalter und die Entstehung der grossen Hexenverfolgung* (Munich and Leipzig, Oldenbourg, pp. xv, 538) there has just appeared from the pen of Joseph Hansen, the well-known archivist of Cologne, the most important monograph of our time on the general history of the witch-persecution. It is, indeed, the most elaborate of all studies as to the origin of the great delusion. The book (which forms the twelfth volume of the *Historische Zeitschrift's Historische Bibliothek*) is to be supplemented by a volume (already in the press) of *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Hexenwahns und der Hexenverfolgung im Mittelalter*. So far as he has gone his work must take the place long held by the book of Soldan as the standard authority upon its subject; and it is to be hoped that what he now gives us is but the first half of a comprehensive history of the persecution.

G. L. B.

The Life, Unpublished Letters and Philosophical Regimen of Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury, Author of the "Characteristics," edited by Benjamin Rand, Ph.D. (London: Swan Sonnenschein; New York: The Macmillan Co., pp. xxxi, 535). This volume includes some material which has been published before, but the larger portion appears in print for the

first time. The new material is partly of philosophical, partly of historical interest. The most important part of the book for the student of philosophy is what the editor has called the *Regimen*, for which Shaftesbury's own name was *Askemata* (exercises). This occupies 272 pages, and consists of a series of reflections and monitions modeled largely in both form and contents on the writings of Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius. Some passages lay more emphasis upon the functions of reason and will in the moral life than we find in the *Characteristics*, where the stress falls upon *feeling* as the most important factor. Whether such passages mark an earlier stage in Shaftesbury's philosophy, or are rather an indication that he pitched the note of his own striving in a more strenuous key than that of his essays for the public, can not be determined from the text, as the editor has not preserved the chronological order of the original, but has ordered the contents under topics.

The historical interest of the volume lies in the letters to prominent men, written for the most part between 1700 and 1712. These show Shaftesbury the earnest supporter of the Whig cause, the promoter of a better understanding between England and Holland in the struggle against Louis, the faithful friend of the French Protestants, the statesman to whose vision it seemed possible to carry "the point of liberty and balance further than first intended or thought of, so as to bring not Europe only but Asia and in a manner the whole world under one community; or at least to such a correspondence and intercourse of good offices and mutual succor as to render it a more humane world than it was ever known." The private letters show a sincere generous character, worthy of the man who gave a new and distinctly upward turn to the ethical and social theories of the eighteenth century.

JAMES H. TUFTS.

Logs of the Great Sea-Fights, 1794-1805, edited by T. Sturges Jackson, Rear-Admiral. Vol. II. (London, Navy Records Society, pp. 343). The plan of Admiral Jackson's second volume is precisely like that of the first, which we reviewed last year (V. 793). That volume embraced the battles of the First of June, St. Vincent and Camperdown. The present is devoted to the Battle of the Nile, Copenhagen and Trafalgar. In each fight the record is made almost complete, for there are logs or official journals for nearly every vessel engaged, even including in the case of the last two combats (it will be remembered that at the Nile there were no secondary vessels), the logs of frigates and sloops and bomb-vessels and fire-ships, which often, from their position, external to the main conflict, are able to afford an interesting contribution of fact. As largely as possible, and especially in the case of Trafalgar, the record presented in the logs is supplemented by letters written within a few days after the fights by the commanders or lieutenants of ships. Captain Hood's letter from Aboukir, that of Captain Miller, already printed by Nicolas, and that of Rear-Admiral Graves from

Copenhagen, are especially interesting. That Nelson ignored a positive signal from Sir Hyde Parker at Copenhagen is made abundantly certain. In the case of Trafalgar the records printed cover not only the day of the combat, but the days immediately succeeding, which severely tested the energy and seamanship of the fleet.

Admiral Jackson's volumes have presented the most perfect possible body of materials for the study of these six great battles. It is needless to say that these records make dry reading for the non-professional reader. He will not be able to read without emotion the bare and formal record: "Partial firing continued until 4.30, when a victory having been reported to the Right Honourable Lord Viscount Nelson, K.B. and Commander-in-Chief, he then died of his wound;" but it is an emotion imported from other narratives. To the serious student of naval warfare by sailing ships, however, these volumes must forever be indispensable.

With Both Armies in South Africa, by Richard Harding Davis. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, pp. xii, 238.) This volume, covering the personal adventures of a clever newspaper correspondent on both sides of the line, possesses the keen zest of injudicious frankness. A campaign to-day evokes such an avalanche of publication that to be fresh one must go beyond mere war matter or mere literary excellence. This the author has done. Mr. Davis sympathized with the under dog, though all his friends were in the British camp. First visiting the "corrugated zinc dust-bin of Ladysmith," he adds a few colors to the siege and relief we already know; then making his way via Lourenço Marques to Pretoria, the first distant view of its dark-green poplars and red-topped roofs oddly suggested Florence, an impression the ox-teams in the streets alongside tramway and victoria speedily dissipated. Among the British, at home and in camp, Mr. Davis found much "hysterical" war fever; among the Boers none. The latter are not 'cute and boorish, as the Briton declares them; "I have never seen an uncivil Boer," says Mr. Davis. Soundly berated by the Briton, the Boer had no ill words for his opponent; and except the British prisoners, no sign of war existed in Pretoria. That to crush thirty thousand potential soldiers, England should have required so vast a force seems odd to us all; and our author justly condemns the "good pig-sticking" at Elandslaagte, and the lying unburied three days of the killed at Spion Kop. He contrasts Mr. Kruger's personal simplicity and official state; suggests a likeness to Cleveland, and refers to his bitterness against the British, while President Steyn's attitude was one of amused tolerance. In commenting on the good treatment of the British prisoners, Mr. Davis dubs the action of some of their officers "unsportsmanlike, ungentlemanly and foolish," and maintains that the Boer has been murdered and robbed because the Briton coveted his watch and chain—strong words. The small number of Boers who repeatedly stood off the hosts of English evokes his admiration, and the battle of Sand River is vividly described.

In truth it has been a strange war; one in which England has learned what will make for her eventual good. In war failure teaches lessons, not success. When Pretoria was taken, however, would it not have been more generous as well as far-sighted to make an end of it by liberal terms, rather than demand unconditional surrender with all its *sequelae*?

This book is full of picturesque interest, though so unnecessarily outspoken that one wonders whether Mr. Davis will hereafter be as much at home in Piccadilly or Pall Mall.

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

Roger Ludlow, The Colonial Lawmaker, by John M. Taylor. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, pp. 166.) This book is addressed to the general reader rather than the historical student. A few new facts are brought to light; but they were hardly sufficient to require a volume to put them in their proper setting. The bibliography which is appended shows that the author has spared no pains in collecting his material; but it is to be regretted that he has seldom referred to his authority for any statement, except in so general a way as to furnish little assistance to one who desires to verify it. The volume has neither notes nor index.

A letter of Ludlow's is quoted (p. 70) which brings into light one phase of his character which has been little noticed heretofore in New England history. In 1637, during the first Pequot war, he writes, and with evident sincerity, from Windsor, to Pynchon, at Agawam, at a time when each was directing the defensive operations in his neighborhood:

"I must confess both you and ourselves do stand merely by the power of our God: therefore he must and ought to have all the praise of it."

The most valuable part of Mr. Taylor's work is to be found in the sixteenth chapter. Here we have the results of new investigations of his own, which are of great interest. What became of Ludlow after he left Connecticut, in 1654, was wholly unknown until within recent years, when he was definitely traced back to England. Mr. Taylor now takes up the story where Waters, Stiles, Chester and Beers had left it, and shows us that after his return he fulfilled important functions under the English government. He went from Connecticut to Virginia, and thence to Ireland (p. 145). A few months later, after a short visit to England, we find him placed by the Irish Council on a special commission of seven, headed by the Chief Justice, to determine all claims as to forfeited lands in Ireland. This was followed in a few weeks by his being put on the commission of the peace for the county of Cork (p. 148), apparently as a justice of the quorum. Mr. Taylor argues with much reason that these appointments would not have been made so soon after Ludlow's arrival, had he not been invited by Cromwell to return to Ireland for that very purpose. Failing to get the ministers of New England to remove there,

he turned to their statesmen. Ludlow was named, some years later, on a new commission for a similar purpose, created by direct order of the Lord Protector (p. 154), and also made a master in chancery. As late as 1664 he was living in Dublin, then being a man of seventy-four (p. 156).

Mr. Taylor does not overrate Ludlow's contribution to the law of Connecticut. He framed the first colonial code, and did it so well that, after two centuries, most of his titles were still preserved in force, wholly in substance, and largely in form (p. 102). Only a skilled lawyer and wise jurist could have accomplished this work, and that Ludlow is the acknowledged author of the code of 1650 gives strong ground for the inference that his was the pen that gave legal shape and precision to the political ideas which, under the lead of Thomas Hooker, were put into the Constitution of 1639.

Philip Vickers Fithian: Journal and Letters, 1767-1774, Student at Princeton College 1770-72, Tutor at Nomini Hall in Virginia 1773-74. Edited for the Princeton Historical Association by J. Rogers Williams. (Princeton, University Library, pp. 344.) The new historical society at Princeton could hardly find a more interesting human document than this for its first publication. Through Mr. Williams's kindness, the readers of this REVIEW were given a taste of the quality of Fithian's diary in a previous volume (V. 290-319). The whole twelve-months' journal is now printed in full, and very handsomely, though we think it a blemish that the habit of the manuscript in using dashes instead of periods is followed. Most of the volume before us is made up of this diary, with its vivid, gossipy and entertaining picture of life on a great Virginian plantation just before the Revolution. Prefixed to this, however, are several letters of college days, written either by Fithian or to him. They reveal to us a thoroughly good, but lively and pleasant boy, an earnest student, a good son, a youth having in him the making of the devoted patriot he afterwards showed himself. They give many pleasant glimpses of college life, for which unfortunately no journal of Fithian's is extant. At the end are printed ten letters written from Virginia, of which the most interesting is a long letter of advice addressed to Fithian's classmate John Peck, who was to succeed him as tutor to the children of Councillor Carter. The letter marked as addressed to Pelatiah Webster can hardly have been written to the publicist, a man of forty-nine. There are several really beautiful pictures in the book—the noble old avenue of poplars at Nomini Hall, the Longstreet House at Princeton, Yeocomico Church, the Tayloe house, Mount Airy, and the portrait of Councillor Carter by Sir Joshua Reynolds. Thanks are due to Mr. Williams and the new society for bringing forward so good a document.

In the fifteenth volume of the *Collections of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin* (Madison, pp. 491) the first place in point of inter-

est belongs to a diary kept by one of the Swiss immigrants who in 1845 founded New Glarus, a diary kept from the time of his leaving his home in Switzerland till his arrival in the new home, and now translated from the original German. Next perhaps come the reports which Rev. Cutting Marsh, Presbyterian missionary from 1831 on, addressed to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and the Scottish Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, respecting the Stockbridge Indians among whom he labored; and the journal kept by Alfred Brunson, Methodist preacher, on a journey from Pennsylvania to Wisconsin in 1835. We should rather say, first among the new materials; for great interest attaches to the narrative by Madame Thérèse Baird concerning early life in the territory, a continuation of her Mackinaw reminiscences. The editor of the volume, Mr. Reuben G. Thwaites, has also added narratives derived from interviews with old French and other settlers, and a longer body of reminiscences, of pioneering in the Wisconsin lead-region, by Theodore Rodolf. There is also a government report on the region in 1831, by Samuel Stambaugh, U. S. Indian agent at Green Bay.

NOTES AND NEWS

Moses Coit Tyler, professor of American History in Cornell University, died on December 28. Born at Griswold, Connecticut, in 1835, he was graduated at Yale in 1857. He was a pastor at Poughkeepsie for two years during the war time. From 1867 to 1881 he was professor of English literature at the University of Michigan, and from 1881 to the time of his death he occupied the chair of American history at Cornell University. He was a most graceful speaker, and a writer of remarkable gifts, whose *History of American Literature* may fairly be called a classic. He was also a man of most engaging traits, friendly, sympathetic, serene and refined, and had a large circle of friends. He was one of the principal founders of the American Historical Association. The work above mentioned, by which he is best known, was continued in 1897 by his *Literary History of the American Revolution*. In 1888 he printed, in the "American Statesmen" series, a book on Patrick Henry which was a model of what a small biography should be. At the time of his death Professor Tyler was first vice-president of the American Historical Association, and but for his death he would have been chosen its president.

The Right Rev. Dr. Mandell Creighton, Bishop of London, died on January 14. Born in Carlisle in 1843, he studied at Oxford, and became a fellow and tutor of Merton College. After passing some years as vicar of Embleton and an honorary canon of Newcastle, he in 1884 was elected to the Dixie professorship of ecclesiastical history at Cambridge. He had already published the first two volumes of his chief work, a *History of the Papacy during the Reformation*, and minor books on the *Age of Elizabeth* and on Simon de Montfort. Other small books on Cardinal Wolsey and on Carlisle followed. In 1887 he published two more volumes of his great work—a work distinguished as much for candor and breadth of view as for scholarship—and in 1894 a fifth. Meantime, on the inauguration of the *English Historical Review*, in 1886, Canon Creighton became its editor, and he continued as such till 1891. He then became Bishop of Peterborough. From that see he was translated to London in 1897. A prelate of moderate views, of great executive capacity, of distinguished bearing and of high repute for scholarship, it was believed that he was destined for still higher preferment. His great historical work was, of necessity, permanently interrupted when he went to the see of London. In 1886 Professor Creighton visited this country, representing Emmanuel College and the University of Cambridge at the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Harvard College.

Jacques Victor Albert, Duc de Broglie, died on January 19, aged nearly eighty. Born in 1821, he was already a member of the French Academy in 1863, having published in 1856 a remarkable work on *L'Église et l'Empire Romain au IV^e Siècle*, which he continued by works on Julian and Theodosius. As a member of the National Assembly and a leader of the Right Centre he did much to procure the downfall of M. Thiers in 1873, and he was prime minister under President MacMahon from 1873 to 1874 and in 1877. For nine years he was a senator. After the close of his political career he occupied himself again with history. The most noted of his books was *Le Secret du Roi* (1878), dealing with the private diplomacy of Louis XV. Later works were *Frédéric II. et Marie Thérèse*, 1882, *Frédéric II. et Louis XV.*, 1884, *Marie-Thérèse Impératrice*, 1888, *Maurice de Saxe et le Marquis d'Argenson*, 1893. He also edited the memoirs of Talleyrand published in 1891.

We have also to announce, with much regret, the recent death of William Wirt Henry, LL.D., of Richmond. He was born in 1831, the grandson of Patrick Henry and of William Wirt, and worthily maintained the best traditions of Virginia gentlemen of the old school. He was once president of the American Historical Association, and for several years was president of the Virginia Historical Society. In 1891 he published *Patrick Henry; Life, Correspondence and Speeches*, an elaborate biography in three volumes, which also forms by far the best history of Virginia for the period involved.

When Professor E. A. Ross of Leland Stanford University was dismissed in November last under circumstances well known to the public, Dr. George E. Howard, principal professor of history and senior member of the faculty, made a vigorous public protest. In January President Jordan demanded that he should either apologize or resign. He of course resigned, and has been followed by Professor David E. Spencer, and by others not of the historical department. Dr. Gaillard T. Lapsley of Cambridge and Mr. Joseph P. Warren of Boston have accepted temporary positions in that department, caused by these resignations.

Professor Charles Henry Hull, hitherto of the department of economics and finance in Cornell University, has been elected professor of American history to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Professor Moses Coit Tyler.

Professor Herbert B. Adams, after twenty-five years of energetic and fruitful work for the Johns Hopkins University, has resigned its chair of history on account of ill health. We are sure that he is attended into his retirement by the best wishes of the profession, of which he has been so conspicuously useful a member.

It is expected that, after the completion of the present volume of this REVIEW, the position of managing editor will be assumed by Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin of the University of Michigan.

Professor William MacDonald of Bowdoin College is to succeed Dr. J. F. Jameson as professor of history in Brown University.

In the second number of the *Revue de Synthèse Historique* M. Xenopol, defending his previous utterances, discusses "Les Faits de Répétition et les Faits de Succession;" M. A. Bossert essays portraits of Niebuhr, Ranke, Sybel and Mommsen; M. Henri Berr discusses Pascal and his place in the history of ideas. There is a general survey of the history of mathematics, and a composite article reviewing, in various departments, the representation of the historical sciences in the congresses of 1900 at Paris.

An international congress of the historical sciences will be held at Rome in the spring of 1902. There will be three sections, devoted respectively to methodology, to ancient and to modern history. Correspondence respecting membership and attendance may be addressed to Professor Ettore Pais, via Caracciolo 8, Naples.

A second edition of Mr. A. P. C. Griffin's *List of Books relating to the Theory of Colonization*, etc. (Washington, Government Printing Office) has just appeared.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons have brought out *Social Life of the Hebrews*, by the Rev. E. Day, being Number 3 of the Semitic Series, edited by Professor J. A. Craig.

The Warburton lectures for 1880-1884, by Dr. Alfred Edersheim, are published by Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co., under the title, *Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah*, with two appendices on the arrangement, analysis, and recent criticism of the Pentateuch.

The Macmillan Company have published a new and revised edition in three volumes of Dr. J. G. Frazer's *The Golden Bough*.

The same company has just published *A History of Rome for High Schools and Academies*, by Dr. George W. Botsford. In its method and scope this book is similar to the author's *History of Greece*.

The Clarendon Press announces that it will shortly publish a volume on *The Civil and Criminal Procedure of Cicero's Time*, by Mr. A. H. J. Greenidge.

It is understood that Professor Charles H. Haskins, of the University of Wisconsin, is engaged upon an edition of the *Germania* of Tacitus.

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

Among the books in preparation at the Clarendon Press are Eusebius's *Praeparatio Evangelica*, edited and translated by Rev. E. H. Gifford, D.D.; *Eusebii Chronicorum Liber*, edited with facsimiles, by J. K. Fotheringham, M.A.; and *Latin Versions of the Canons of the Greek Councils of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries*, Part II., by C. H. Turner, M.A.

M. H. Welter has now brought out six volumes of his photographic reprint of Mansi, extending to A. D. 451.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

Mr. Guy le Strange, in his *Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate* (Clarendon Press), has devoted himself chiefly to the topographical antiquities of that city. Eight plans constructed by him form the main basis of his text. Twenty-one chapters of topography are followed by three containing a sketch of the history of the city of Baghdad during the period named.

A History of Exploration and Geographical Science from the Opening of the Tenth to the Middle of the Thirteenth Century (A. D. 900-1250), by Mr. C. Raymond Beazley, the continuation of the author's previous work on the period from the conversion of the Roman Empire to 900 A. D., is announced by Mr. John Murray.

M. E. Chatelain has rendered an important service to medieval palaeography by his *Introduction à la Lecture des Notes Tironiennes*, published by the author, and accompanied with an album of eighteen illustrative plates.

Mr. Henry C. Lea's *History of the Inquisition* is being issued in a French translation. Two volumes have already appeared. Professor Paul Fredericq has contributed an introduction, with a bibliography. The translation is by M. Salomon Reinach. The work is being extensively quoted and used by the Liberal party in French politics. Mr. Lea's pamphlet on *The Dead Hand* (Philadelphia, Dornan, 1900) has also been translated.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY.

Six years ago Father L. J. M. Cros, S. J., published a first series of *Documents Nouveaux* on St. Francis Xavier. Before printing more he has been persuaded by his publisher to bring out an extensive biography of the saint, for the general reader, *Saint François de Xavier; Sa Vie et ses Lettres* (Paris, Toulouse, Privat, pp. lvi, 494, xl, 550). It is, however, so richly "documented" as to present almost an autobiography. Meanwhile the editors of the *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu* have published a first volume of *Monumenta Xaveriana ex Autographis vel ex Antiquioribus Exemplis collecta* (Madrid, Avrial, xxxii, 1030, xxxii, 1030), embracing many letters and other writings and having prefixed to it a valuable life of the saint written in 1574, by Father Manoel Teixeira, a companion of the last days of Francis, and Father Alessandro Valignani.

The Hakluyt Society will publish, this year, *Mendana's Voyage to the Solomon Islands in 1568*, in two volumes.

Dr. Julius Beloch, in the *Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaft*, III. 11, attempts an estimate of the population of Europe about A.D. 1600. He concludes that approximately there were in Italy thirteen millions, in France sixteen, in Germany twenty, in all Europe perhaps a hundred millions.

The Life of Abd-ur Rahman, Amir of Afghanistan, G. C. B., G. C. S. I., edited by Sultan Mahomed Khan, in two volumes (London, Murray), contains, first, a translation from the Persian of the narrative of the Amir's early life, written by himself; this is followed by an account of his government of his country and of his daily life and occupations, taken down in his own words by Sultan Mahomed Khan when acting as his state secretary.

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

For the promotion of the projected School of Advanced Historical Studies in London, a strong executive committee has been formed, after a meeting for organization, at which Professor James Bryce presided. The result may be either the success of the proposed school as an independent foundation, or the adoption of the project in some form by the University of London or the School of Political Science.

In the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for January Father A. Zimmermann gives a summary review of the recent English historical publications.

The British Government has published a *Calendar of the Close Rolls, Edward I., 1272-1279*.

The three supplemental volumes of the *Dictionary of National Biography* will, in the main, be devoted to the closing years of the last century. An exception will, nevertheless, be made as regards Queen Victoria, the Bishop of London, and a few other distinguished personages whose lives ended in the early weeks of the present year.

An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England, by Professor Edward P. Cheyney of the University of Pennsylvania (Macmillan) is intended as a text-book for the use of college classes. The thirteenth century is made the starting-point for a continuous study of the economic conditions of the people down to the present time. The plan of the book, as set forth in the announcements, seems excellent.

It is understood that text-books of English history are in preparation by Professors Benjamin Terry of Chicago, Andrews of Bryn Mawr and Cheyney of the University of Pennsylvania respectively.

The Macmillan Company will shortly publish a volume of documents for the use of students of the history, and particularly of the constitutional history, of England, prepared by Professors George B. Adams of Yale University and H. Morse Stephens of Cornell.

Mr. Alexander Gardner, of Paisley, has ready for publication *A History of the Church in Scotland from the Earliest Times down to the Present Day*, by Mr. John Macpherson.

The corporation of Leicester announce a second volume of the *Records of the Borough of Leicester*, extending from 1327 to 1509, and edited, like its predecessor, by the competent hand of Miss Mary Bateson (London, C. J. Clay and Sons).

Messrs. Archibald Constable and Co. have just published the *Paston Letters, 1422-1509*, a reprint of the edition of 1872-1875, which contained some five hundred letters until then unpublished, and to which are now added others, edited by Mr. James Gairdner, of the Public Record Office.

Professor Gross's *Sources and Literature of English History*, reviewed on a preceding page, stops with the year 1485. It is understood that a volume supplementing it upon much the same plan, and extending from 1485 to the present time, is to be prepared by Professor Wolfgang Michael of Freiburg.

It is understood that Sir Clements Markham and Mr. Raymond Beazley are at work upon a reprint of Hakluyt's *Voyages*, and that the first volume will appear this year.

Mary Queen of Scots, and Who Wrote the Casket Letters? by Mr. Samuel Cowan, will shortly be issued by Messrs. Sampson Low, Marston and Co. The work will give the results of long and careful study of the much-discussed questions of the authenticity and authorship of the letters.

The New Amsterdam Book Company announce *The Rising of 1745*, with a bibliography of Jacobite history (1689-1788), by Mr. C. S. Terry of Aberdeen, Scotland, forming a new volume in the series of *Scottish History from Contemporary Writers*.

The Clarendon Press announces that it will shortly publish Vols. VII. and VIII. of Professor Thorold Rogers's *History of Agriculture and Prices*.

Life in Scotland a Hundred Years Ago, as Reflected in the Old Statistical Accounts of Scotland, 1791-1799, by Mr. James Murray (Paisley, Alexander Gardner) is based upon the twenty-one volumes of Sir John Sinclair's famous compilation of information derived from the ministers of the respective parishes.

Messrs. Methuen announce a new edition of Mr. E. L. S. Horsburgh's *Waterloo*, in which important alterations have been made. An appendix and an index have been added.

Under England's Flag from 1804 to 1809 (Macmillan) is the memoirs, diary, and correspondence of Captain Charles Boothby, of the Royal Engineers, compiled by the last surviving members of his family.

Messrs. Longmans announce for immediate publication a new issue of *Queen Victoria*, by Richard R. Holmes, F.S.A., Librarian to the Queen. The whole of the text, excepting the last chapter, was approved and authorized by Queen Victoria.

Mr. John Murray has in press *The Reminiscences of Sir Edward Malet*, who was for ten years English Ambassador at Berlin, and has represented his country at Washington, Pekin, Athens, and Rome, as well as at Paris during the Commune.

Mr. Henry W. Lucy has continued a well-known and very interesting series by bringing out (London, Arrowsmith) *A Diary of the Unionist Parliament, 1895-1900*, conceived upon the same plan as his previous "diaries."

Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley, in two volumes, by his son, Leonard Huxley (D. Appleton and Co.), is a presentation of Huxley's character and personality, for the most part by means of his letters. These are published chronologically, save where, in a few instances, the letters relating to some special interest or episode are massed in a chapter by themselves. Mr. P. Chalmers Mitchell's *Thomas Henry Huxley* is brought out in this country by Messrs. Putnam.

Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. announce that they have made arrangements for the publication of a life of the late Bishop of London. It will be written by Mrs. Creighton, who will be much obliged if any persons who have letters from the bishop will kindly lend them to her. They may be sent to Fulham Palace, London, S. W.

The Irish Text Society intends to publish, in its medieval series, the earliest version of the *Lebor Gabala*, together with the poems of Eochaid hua Flainn and other antiquaries of the tenth and eleventh centuries on which it is based; the genealogical collections in the great medieval vellums; and the medieval grammatical treatises. In its modern series it proposes to print The Death of Murtach son of Erc and The Expedition of Dathi to the Alps.

Mr. G. C. Moore Smith has in preparation *The Autobiography of Lt.-General Sir Harry Smith, of Aliwal, G.C.B.* (London, Murray.)

Messrs. Smith Elder and Co. have published *A Life-time in South Africa; being the Recollections of the First Premier of Natal*, by the Hon. Sir John Robinson, K.C.M.G. The book contains an account of the author's personal experiences, followed by chapters treating of the Outgoers, the Governors, the Voortrekkers, the Settlers as Pioneers, Lawmakers, Traders, Civilizers and Neighbors, the Natives, the War, its Genesis and its Revelations, and the Outlook.

The first volume of *The Times History of the War*, edited by Mr. L. S. Amery of All Souls College, Oxford, has been published. It covers the period to the outbreak of war.

The South African War, 1899-1900, by Major S. L. Norris (London, Murray) is confined to the military aspects of the war. There are a number of appendices giving the conventions of Pretoria and London, the National Union's Manifesto, and the Majesfontein, Stormberg, and Spion Kop despatches. The book contains several maps.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. E. Fox, *Roman Suffolk* (*Archaeological Journal*, 226); C. A. Moore, *Oriental Cults in Britain* (*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XI.); F. W. Maitland, *The*

Corporation Sole (Law Quarterly Review, October) ; B. Williams, *The Foreign Policy of England under Walpole*, IV. (English Historical Review, January).

FRANCE.

An important committee, including such scholars as M. Imbart de la Tour, M. Chatelain, M. Boulay de la Meurthe, M. Fournier, M. Baudrillart, and M. Noël Valois, has been formed for the publication of scholarly documentary publications illustrating the history of the Church in France. Documents of the Vatican archives as well as of those in France will be undertaken. The usual form of publication will be that of the calendar, with full texts of the most important pieces. The general name of the series will be *Archives de l'Histoire Religieuse de la France*. Among the works proposed are: *Registre des Procès-verbaux de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris*, ed. Chatelain and Denifle; letters of Cardinal du Bellay; instructions given to the French ambassadors in Germany at the time of the Reformation; and, of especial importance, the reports of the papal nuncios in France.

The first volume of M. Lavis's co-operative *Histoire de France* (Hachette) has appeared. It comprises pre-Roman and Roman Gaul, and is written by M. G. Bloch. Part 2 of Vol. II., on the first Capetians, by M. Achille Luchaire, has also appeared; Part 1 of that volume, by MM. Bayet and Kleinclausz, on Christianity and the barbarians, the Merovingians and Carolingians, will be somewhat delayed. The whole work will consist of eight volumes, of the same size and price as those of Lavis and Rambaud's *Histoire Générale*. Of this latter work, by the way, the twelfth and concluding volume, embracing the years from 1870 to 1900, was lately brought out.

Three important volumes of cartularies have lately been published: Vol. III. of the *Cartulaire de l'Église d'Autun*, edited by M. de Charnasse (Paris, Pedone), which contains 202 interesting charters bearing dates from 897 to 1399, and an able introduction on the medieval history of landed property in Burgundy; the *Cartulaire de l'Église d'Angoulême*, edited by the Abbé Nanglard (Angoulême, Chasseignac), consisting of documents of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries; and the second part of M. Lacave-La Plagne-Barris's *Cartulaire du Chapitre d'Auch* (Paris, Champion).

M. Marcellin Boudet, in his *Thomas de la Marche, Bâtard de France, et ses Aventures, 1318-1361* (Paris, Champion) relates the story of a quite extraordinary and romantic career and of an interesting person, a captain in the Hundred Years' War, whom he supposes to have been the son of Philippe de Valois and Blanche of Burgundy, countess of La Marche.

In the "Collection de Textes pour servir," etc. (Paris, Picard) M. Gustave Fagniez has just brought out the second volume (pp. lxxx, 345) of his *Documents relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Industrie et du Commerce en*

France. This volume relates to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and embraces 166 documents, carefully chosen and often of great interest.

M. G. Bonet-Maury's *Histoire de la Liberté de Conscience en France depuis l'Édit de Nantes jusqu'à juillet 1870* (Paris, Alcan) has, we judge from the announcements, a certain close relation to the lectures which he gave in this country.

In the *Annales* of the University of Lyons M. Émile Bourgeois has given, from the author's manuscripts at Berlin, a new edition of Ezekiel Spanheim's *Relation de la Cour de France en 1690* (Paris, Picard) with a corrected text and many useful notes.

The Marquis Costa de Beauregard has made an interesting contribution to the memoir-literature of the Revolution and Empire by publishing a selection from the papers of the Count de la Ferronnays, an enlightened émigré who was much employed in the diplomacy of the exiled Bourbon princes, and from the autobiographical sketches written by his countess, *En Émigration; Souvenirs tirés des Papiers du Comte Auguste de la Ferronnays, 1777-1814* (Paris, Plon, pp. 428).

M. Aulard's fourth volume of police and newspaper pieces called *Paris pendant la Réaction Thermidorienne et sous le Directoire* (Cerf) extends from May 11, 1797, to July 20, 1798, and contributes much to the understanding of the revolution of 18 Fructidor.

Colonel H. de Poyen, after long continued researches in the archives of the French departments of marine and colonies, has printed a most careful military history of the war of Leclerc and Rochambeau in St. Domingo, *Histoire Militaire de la Révolution de Saint-Domingue* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, pp. 555).

Students of the military history of Napoleon will find profit in an *Étude sur le Service d'État Major pendant les Guerres du Premier Empire* (Paris, Chapelot) by Lieutenant-Colonel de Philip, of the French artillery, formerly a member of the general staff of the army.

M. Henri Berton, a lawyer and a friend of Émile Ollivier, has published (Paris, Alcan) a bulky book marked by much care and fairness on *L'Évolution Constitutionnelle du Second Empire*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Abbé Vacandard, *Un Évêque Mérovingien; Saint Ouen dans son Diocèse* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, January); A. Liard, *Saint-Simon et les États Généraux* (*Revue Historique*, March); F. T. Perrens, *Le premier Abbé Dubois*, II. (*Revue Historique*, January); L. Sciout, *Les Élections à la Convention, d'après les Procès-Verbaux des Assemblées Électorales des Départements* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, January); A. Stern, *Sieyès et la Constitution de l'An III*. (*Révolution Française*, XX. 4); G. Caudrillier, *Le Complot de l'An XII*, II. (*Revue Historique*, March); M. Philippson, *La Paix d'Amiens et la Politique Générale de Napoléon I*. (*Revue Historique*, March); F. Masson, *Les Préliminaires du Divorce Imperial*

(Revue de Paris, November 15, December 1); A. Stern, *La Mission Secrète du Marquis de Bellune, Agent du Prince de Polignac à Lisbonne*, 1830 (Revue Historique, January).

ITALY, SPAIN, PORTUGAL.

Signora Jessie White Mario has made a selection from the writings of Mazzini (Florence, Sansoni) for the series of Italian classics which is edited by Professor Carducci. The plan upon which a choice is made is the representation of Mazzini as man of letters, as social philosopher, and as prophet.

Several German and other "relations" concerning the Spanish Armada are printed in the *Mittheilungen des Instituts für oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XX. 4.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Sabatier, *De l'Authenticité de la Légende de Saint François dite des Trois Compagnons* (Revue Historique, January); S. Minocchi, *La Legenda Trium Sociorum*, II. (Archivio Storico Italiano, 1900, 3); A. Contento, *La Popolazione di Venezia dal 1338 al 1795* (Nuovo Archivio Veneto, XIX. 1, 2, XX. 1); K. Häbler, *Zur Geschichte des spanischen Kolonialhandels im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Zeitschrift für Social- und Wirthschaftsgeschichte, VII. 4).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND.

In the *Abhandlungen, Vorträge und Reden* of the late Professor Felix Stieve of Munich (Leipzig, Duncker und Humblot), the pieces of most general historical value are those on the earlier portion of Wallenstein's career, on the relations of Henry IV. to the Jülich question, and others concerning the Thirty Years' War.

The *Revue Historique* for January contains a summary review of German publications of the year 1899 in the field of modern history, by Dr. Martin Philippson.

Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice is about to publish in the form of a book those articles on the Duke of Brunswick which he, it is now known, contributed to the *Edinburgh Review* in 1897 and 1898. The title will be *Charles William Ferdinand, Duke of Brunswick; a Study in the History of the Eighteenth Century*.

In the *Deutsche Rundschau* for December Professor P. Bailleu prints some very interesting letters of Queen Louise of Prussia to her brother George.

Messrs. Harper and Brothers will shortly publish a *Life of the Emperor Frederick*, edited from the German of Margaretha von Poschinger, with an introduction by Sidney Whitman. This book is a condensation of the German original, and deals largely, if not chiefly, with the political and military sides of the Emperor's life.

At the fifth annual session of the Royal Saxon Historical Commission, December 12, it was reported that the *Lehnsbuch Friedrich's des*

Strengen von 1349, ed. Lippert and Beschorner, and the *Akten und Briefe Herzog Georg's*, ed. Gess, were in press. The *Akten zur Geschichte des Bauernkriegs in Mitteldeutschland*, ed. Merx., Vol. II. of the *Politische Korrespondenz des Kurfürsten Moritz*, ed. Brandenburg, the correspondence of the Electress Maria Antonia with the Empress Maria Theresa, ed. Lippert, and the *Akten zur Geschichte des Heilbronner Bundes von 1632-33*, ed. Kretzschmar, were reported as ready for printing. It was agreed to undertake the publication of the autograph letters (and draughts) of Augustus the Strong, to be edited by Dr. P. Haake of Berlin.

The Historical Commission of Baden has in the press the fifth volume of the *Politische Correspondenz Karl Friedrich's von Baden*, ed. Obser, and Vol. II. of the *Regesten der Markgrafen von Baden*, ed. Witte. The Commission will publish an index to Vols. I.-XXXIX. of the *Zeitschrift für Geschichte des Oberrheins*.

A new commission for the publication of documents and correspondence illustrating the modern history of Austria has been instituted at Vienna by the ministry of education.

Hofrath Theodor von Sickel, founder and director of the Austrian Historical Institute at Rome, has resigned the charge of that establishment.

M. Edouard Rott's *Histoire de la Représentation de la France en Suisse*, of which the first volume has now been published at Paris by Alcan, will consist of nine volumes. In the first six, chronological lists of the various diplomatic agents and of the documents relating to their missions will be followed by the history of those missions and the text of many documents; the seventh and eighth will give biographies of the agents; the ninth will describe their personal life in Switzerland.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: K. Zeumer, *Zur Geschichte der westgothischen Gesetzgebung* (Neues Archiv, XXIV. 1); K. Wenck, *Französische Werbungen um die deutsche Königskrone zur Zeit Philipp's des Schönen und Clemens' V.* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXVI. 2); A. Götze, *Die Artikel der Bauern, 1525* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, IV. 1); O. Hintze, *Der oesterreichische und der preussischen Beamtenstaat im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXVI. 3); H. Oncken, *Grossherzog Peter von Oldenburg* (Preussische Jahrbücher, December).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM.

In the January number of the *Revue des Questions Historiques* Professor A. Delescluse presents a summary review of recent historical publications in Belgium.

M. Henri Pirenne, in a volume published by the Commission Royale d'Histoire de Belgique, and entitled *Le Soulèvement de la Flandre Maritime, 1323-1328*, prints a curious report of the commissioners appointed to investigate as to the property of those Flemings who took part in the

battle of Cassel. He shows that that battle was the result of a social revolt like that of 1381 in England.

Dr. W. P. C. Knuttel has published the third part of his learned and elaborate catalogue of the pamphlets in the Royal Library at The Hague. This volume covers the important years from 1689 to 1713.

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.

In the *Mémoires et Documents* published by the Société de l'École des Chartes, Vol. IV., M. F. Chalandon has presented an excellent study of Alexis Comnenos, substituting for the traditional view, and laying before the larger public, the history of that prince as already known to scholars, *Essai sur le Règne d'Alexis I^{er} Comnène* (Paris, Picard).

Messrs. Scribners are the American agents for the Wolseley Series of war memoirs, edited by Captain Walter H. James, of which the latest issue is *Operations of General Gurko's Advance Guard in 1877*, by Colonel Epauchin of the Russian staff. The volume describes General Gurko's advance over the Balkan Mountains and the capture of the Shipka Pass.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Gelzer, *Das Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche in Byzanz* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXVI. 2); Baron A. d'Avril, *La Protection des Chrétiens dans le Levant* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, 1900, 4).

AMERICA.

In our next two numbers we expect to print, in the section devoted to documents, a collection of interesting letters, derived from various sources, illustrating the history of the nullification controversy in South Carolina.

Messrs. Appleton and Co. have in preparation a new supplementary volume of *Appleton's Cyclopedia of American Biography*, edited by General James Grant Wilson. The volume will cover the last twelve years, and will also contain a complete list of the pseudonyms mentioned in the preceding volumes.

Messrs. Henry Holt and Co. have published an enlarged and thoroughly revised edition of Johnston's *History of the United States*. The work of revision has been done by Professor MacDonald of Bowdoin College.

Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons have published *North Americans of Yesterday*, a comparative study of North-American Indian life, customs, etc., by Mr. F. S. Dellenbaugh. The volume is chiefly made up from a course of lectures given before the Lowell Institute of Boston. The author accompanied Major John W. Powell of the Bureau of American Ethnology upon the second Colorado expedition, and his book treats of the material then collected.

Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin and Co. have published as Volume XXXII. of the "American Statesmen" series a *General Index* to the series, with a

selected bibliography, both prepared, with great care, by Dr. Theodore Clarke Smith.

In the series of *Old South Leaflets* the latest issues are Lincoln's Cooper Institute Address; Choate's "Romance of New England History;" an account of the invention of the steamboat; Horace Mann's "Ground of the Free School System;" and Kossuth's first speech in Faneuil Hall, 1852.

Mr. Charles K. Bolton, librarian of the Boston Athenaeum, has published (Salem, Eben Putnam), a pamphlet entitled *Marriage Notices, 1785-1794, for the Whole United States, copied from the Massachusetts Centinel and the Columbian Centinel*.

Messrs. Joel Munsell's Sons (Albany) have published a *List of Titles of Genealogical Articles in American Periodicals*, and kindred works, giving the name, residence, and earliest date of the first settler of each family.

The Macmillan Co. will shortly publish *American Diplomatic Questions*, by Mr. John B. Henderson, Jr. The book consists of a series of essays upon the Behring Sea Controversy, the North-East Coast Fisheries, Samoa, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Negotiations relating to the Isthmian Canal.

The Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1898-1899 contains a chapter upon the development of the common school in the Western States from 1830 to 1865, a preliminary bibliography of Confederate text-books, and a contribution to the history of normal schools in the United States.

Mr. John Lane is publishing a new edition of Sir Arthur Helps's *The Spanish Conquest in America*, edited by Mr. M. Oppenheim. The first volume has already appeared.

The Clarendon Press (New York, Henry Frowde), has just published a second series of *Voyages of the Elizabethan Seamen to America*, edited from the pages of Hakluyt by Mr. E. J. Payne. This volume contains the narratives of Gilbert, Amidas and Barlow, Cavendish and Raleigh.

Vol. LXXI. of the *Jesuit Relations* will contain a full statement of the facts relating to the portrait recently discovered in Montreal, and believed by so excellent an authority as Father Hamy of Boulogne-sur-Mer to be a genuine likeness of Father Marquette.

Dr. Francis N. Thorpe has just published *A Constitutional History of the United States, 1765-1885*, in three volumes (Chicago, Callaghan and Co.). The first volume deals with the national development during the Revolutionary War, and with the formation of the Constitution; Vol. II. covers the period from 1787 to 1861, and Vol. III. is devoted to the consideration of the problems of emancipation and suffrage.

Mr. William Abbatt, 281 Fourth Avenue, New York, announces a new edition of the *Memoirs of Major-General Heath*, to be ready May 1. This is the first republication since the original edition in 1798.

The Rev. Cyrus Townsend Brady is writing a life of Benedict Arnold and his second wife, Margaret Shippen. He would be pleased to hear of unpublished material, especially such as relates to Arnold's life in England. Mr. Brady's address is 6347 Woodbine Avenue, Philadelphia.

Professor Max Farrand of Wesleyan University has undertaken the preparation of a work certain to be highly useful to all students of our constitutional history—a critical edition of all the acts of the Philadelphia Convention of 1787, embracing both the official journal and all the unofficial notes of debates, so arranged as to permit ready reference at once to all the records of any given day, and properly supplied with scholarly annotations.

The *Records of the Catholic American Historical Society* for December prints the diary of Archbishop Maréchal, 1818 to 1825, and also a list of Spanish-American bishops from 1594 to 1600, taken from the *Acta* of the Consistorial Congregation.

Le Communisme au Nouveau Monde, by François Sagot (Paris, Larose, pp. 235), is reported as a careful study of our various communistic experiments.

Mr. D. McKay (Philadelphia) has brought out a new edition of Lossing's *Pictorial History of the Civil War*.

Mr. C. D. Rhodes has written a *History of the Cavalry of the Army of the Potomac: including that of the Army of Virginia* (Hudson-Kimberly Publishing Co.). The work also deals with the operations of the Federal cavalry in West Virginia.

Mr. Daniel Fish has brought out (Minneapolis Public Library), under the title, *Lincoln Literature*, a bibliographical account of books and pamphlets relating to Abraham Lincoln.

The Autobiography of a Journalist, by William J. Stillman (Houghton, Mifflin and Co.) will be of interest not alone because of the varied life of its subject, but also because of the number of distinguished men whose friendship Mr. Stillman possessed. Among these were Bryant, Lowell, Emerson and Agassiz, Ruskin and the Rossettis.

The Thirteenth Annual Report of the Massachusetts Commissioner of (local) Public Records contains a review of the colonial and state legislation concerning the public records, and an account of the state's standard ink, with formula, and standard record paper.

The January number of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* is accompanied by a monograph of 157 pages on Massachusetts Labor Legislation, by Miss Sarah Scovill Whittelsey, Ph.D., which begins with a sketch of the history of the labor laws of that state.

Mr. S. T. Pickard has edited the letters of Whittier to Professor Elizur Wright (Boston, C. E. Goodspeed), and published them in a volume called *Whittier as a Politician*.

The *Life and Letters of Phillips Brooks*, by Professor Alexander V. G. Allen, of the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge (E. P. Dutton and Co.) is published in two volumes of 1619 pages, the greater part of which is drawn from the letters and papers of the bishop. The result is a careful and minute study of the career of one of the greatest of American divines.

The American Antiquarian Society proposes to publish the *Diary of Librarian Christopher Columbus Baldwin, 1829-1835*, edited by Mr. Nathaniel Paine.

The January number of the *Publications* of the Rhode Island Historical Society consists almost entirely of a selection from the papers of William Vernon lent by Mrs. E. W. Blake. The papers here selected from the mass of the Vernon Papers are those illustrating the history of the Navy Board for New England, maintained by Congress during the Revolutionary War, and consisting of Vernon, James Warren of Massachusetts and John Deshon of Connecticut. They are an important series, especially in view of the paucity of our materials for the naval history of the Revolution. This number completes the eighth volume of the *Publications*. It is now contemplated that this series be discontinued, and that its place be taken by an annual volume of *Collections*, continuing the original series of *Collections* of which nine volumes were published between 1827 and 1897, but which has of late been increased only at irregular intervals.

It is understood that a third volume of the *Records of the State of Connecticut* was finished in manuscript by the late Dr. C. J. Hoadly just before his death. It is to be hoped that it will soon be printed.

The *Annual Report* of the Comptroller of the State of New York announces the completion of the work of binding, indexing, and otherwise rendering accessible, the original documents relating to the Revolutionary War which are to be found in his office. The set as bound numbers fifty-two volumes.

In the recent issues of the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* (December-February) is printed a list of the documents and papers relating to the northeastern boundary of the United States, by Mr. A. R. Hasse; a check-list of municipal and state documents relating to New York City; a list of works concerning the financial and commercial history of the town; and a list of the maps and atlases which represent, or relate to, New York.

It is understood that the New York Historical Society hopes soon to begin the erection of one section of its proposed new building, on Central Park West, between Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Streets.

There has recently been discovered in London the British headquarters' colored manuscript map of New York and environs during the period of the Revolutionary War. It shows the fortifications, defences, roads, etc., together with the harbor, islands, and river frontages on the Hud-

son and East Rivers ; also the military works on Long Island and parts of the Jersey shore. A limited number of facsimile copies will be published, for subscribers only, by B. F. Stevens (London).

The Reform Club of New York City has published a *History of Tammany Hall* by Mr. Gustavus Myers.

The *History of Westchester County*, by Mr. Frederick Shonnard and Mr. W. W. Spooner (New York History Co.), contains a careful account of the early English and Dutch settlements, and is chiefly concerned with the period preceding the Revolution.

Vol. XX. of the *New Jersey Archives* is Vol. IV. of Mr. Nelson's Newspaper Extracts, extending from 1756 to 1761. A History of Printers and Printing in New Jersey prior to 1801, intended for this volume, is deferred, but will probably appear in connection with Vol. XXIII., the next volume to be devoted to newspaper extracts. It will be remembered that Mr. Nelson has heretofore brought his account of newspapers and early printing, in alphabetical order of states, down through New Hampshire. Vol. XXI. is a calendar, prepared by Mr. Berthold Fernow, of the records in the office of the secretary of state of New Jersey relating to the period 1664-1703, ending with the union of East and West Jersey. There must be six or seven thousand documents here summarized. They furnish a large body of fresh material for the student of government, land-purchases and land-grants in the Jerseys.

In the January number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Mr. Lewis Burd Walker continues his biography of Margaret Shippen, wife of Benedict Arnold. Among the interesting documents printed is a journal kept by Col. Elias Boudinot, commissary-general of prisoners, while sojourning in the city of New York in February, 1778, looking after the welfare of the American prisoners and arranging exchanges ; also letters of Rev. Percival Locke and Rev. George Craig, missionaries of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, written from Lancaster, Penn., 1746-52. The annual report of the treasurer of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania shows the society to possess property to the amount of \$289,638.

The Immigration of the Irish Quakers into Pennsylvania, 1682-1750, with their Early History in Ireland, by Mr. Albert Cook Myers, of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania (published by the author), will shortly appear. The author has made use of printed and manuscript collections relating to his subject in Dublin, Paris and London, as well as of the Friends' Historical Library of Swarthmore College, the largest collection of Friends' books in America, and other similar material.

In the November number of the *Publications of the Southern History Association* we note a body of reminiscences of Southern frontier life in Revolutionary days, prepared about 1842 for Dr. Lyman C. Draper, by Col. William Martin, of Smith County, Tennessee, the oldest son of General Joseph Martin. The father may, in part, be regarded as the

source of the narratives; but the son, also, born in 1765, remembered the period in question. In the January issue of the same journal Mr. Ernest A. Smith, of Allegheny College, begins a valuable series of articles on the history of the Confederate Treasury.

The Virginia Historical Society reports that its catalogue of manuscripts is nearly printed. General G. W. Custis Lee has deposited with the Society a large collection of manuscripts relating to the Parke, Custis, Washington and Lee families. Major Powhatan Ellis has presented much valuable material, printed and manuscript, among the latter being a part of the papers of Governor and Senator Powhatan Ellis.

The January number of the *Virginia Magazine of History* contains some interesting letters of Harrison Gray and Harrison Gray, jr., loyalists of Boston; the usual instalment of notes from the early records of the Council and General Court; and a list of members of the House of Burgesses, supplementing and furnishing a guide to all previous lists. The Nicholson-Blair documents now published bring the affair up to the return of Blair and the recall of Nicholson; those from the McDonald collection relate to the deposition of Governor Harvey. The will of Mary Washington's mother, Mrs. Mary Hewes, is printed.

Numbers 10, 11, and 12, completing the eighteenth volume of the *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, form a study of the part played by the Baptists in the struggle for religious freedom in Virginia, by Mr. William T. Thom. A map, traced from the Lewis map which is prefixed to Jefferson's *Notes on Virginia* (1794), accompanies the volume and illustrates the growth of the Baptist churches between 1770 and 1776.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* for January continues the papers of the First Council of Safety of that state, and those relating to the mission of Colonel John Laurens in Europe, 1781. The genealogical section deals with the Barnwell family.

No. 7 of the *Transactions of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina* consists mainly of an historical sketch of the Huguenot Congregations of South Carolina, by the late Daniel Ravenel, with notes by the late W. G. De Saussure (Charleston, pp. 74).

Messrs. M. F. Mansfield and Co. announce *Recollections of a Georgia Loyalist*, by Elizabeth Lichtenstein Johnston, edited by the Rev. Arthur W. Eaton.

Mr. Thomas M. Owen has been elected Director of the Department of Archives and History in the state of Alabama, which was established by an act of February 27.

The *American Historical Magazine* for October (Nashville, Tenn.) contained a body of records of Washington County, Tennessee, beginning with the establishment of the Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions by North Carolina in 1778 and coming down to 1790, to be continued in the later issues of the magazine.

Messrs. Macmillan and Co. announce *Reconstruction in Mississippi*, a careful study, by Mr. James W. Garner, fellow in political science at Columbia University, formerly associate in history at the Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria.

The Louisiana Historical Society has invited the co-operation of other historical societies in the Mississippi Valley in an effort to persuade the United States government to cause to be copied and published the most important portions of the archives of colonial Louisiana now preserved in Paris.

In the January *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association the interesting reminiscences of Mrs. Dilue Harris are continued. Mr. Eugene C. Barker presents the Difficulties of an American Revenue Officer, from the papers of Captain Antonio Tenorio, who in 1835 performed that difficult office at Anahuac; Dr. W. F. McCaleb prints an account of the first period of the Gutierrez-Magee Expedition.

Numbers I. and II. of the *Publications of the Illinois State Historical Library* are, respectively, a Bibliography of Newspapers published in Illinois prior to 1860, compiled by Dr. Edmund J. James and Mr. M. J. Loveness, both of the University of Chicago, and a collection, with comment by Dr. James, of the Territorial Laws of Illinois, from 1809 to 1812.

A quarterly entitled *Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter* is published by the Deutsch-Amerikanische Historische Gesellschaft von Illinois (Koelling and Klappenbach), and edited by members of the society. Part I., which appeared for January, 1901, contains contributions to the history of the German pioneers of Illinois.

Wisconsin's Deutsch-Amerikaner bis zum Schluss des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, the first volume of which, by Wilhelm H. Jensen (Milwaukee, Deutsche Gesellschaft), has just appeared, treats of the part played by the German-Americans in social and political life, and of the modifying influences upon them of their new environment. The present volume carries the history of German-Americanism to about the year 1875.

The January number of the *Annals of Iowa* contains an article on George Wilson, first territorial adjutant, by his son, George Wilson; one on Charles Mason, first chief-justice of the territorial supreme court, by Judge Emlin McClain; and one on the First Legislative Assembly in Iowa Territory, by Rev. Dr. William Slater.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Woodrow Wilson, *Colonies and Nation*, I.-IV. (Harper's Monthly Magazine, January-April); F. R. Lassiter, *Arnold's Invasion of Virginia, 1781* (Sewanee Review, January); C. J. Bullock, *Direct Taxes and the Federal Constitution*, I. (Yale Review, February); James Bradley Thayer, *A Picture of Chief Justice Marshall* (Atlantic, March).

The
American Historical Review

THE REPUBLIC OF SAN MARINO

THE Republic of San Marino, the oldest and smallest in the world, deserves on both these grounds the attention of Americans, to whom the following pages, the result of two visits to the miniature commonwealth of the Apennines and of considerable study of its history, may be of interest. Much has been written in French and Italian about San Marino,¹ and the documents of the republic have been carefully arranged by Professor Malagola of Bologna, in the archives beneath the new government building;² but with the exception of the late Mr. J. T. Bent's now almost obsolete *Freak of Freedom*, and of a translation from the French made by an American, who was created a citizen of San Marino, Mr. William Warren Tucker, there is no book in English about the sole surviving example of the Italian medieval republics.

The legendary origin of this tiny state is described in the *Actæ Sanctorum*, the authors of which based their account on two manuscripts and three printed lives of the saint from whom San Marino derives its name. These accounts, even the earliest of which was written some centuries after the events recorded, are a mixture of fables and miracles, but perhaps contain some grains of fact. According to the most probable version, two friends, Marinus and Leo, natives of the Dalmatian island of Arbe, crossed the Adriatic soon after the middle of the fourth century of our era, and settled at Rimini on the Italian coast. At a distance of about fifteen miles rises the picturesque cliff, called Monte Titano either from the

¹ A very complete bibliography of books and articles about San Marino was published in 1899 by Baron L. de Montalbo, Duke A. Ostrando, and Count A. Galati di Riella, under the title of *Dizionario Bibliografico Iconografico della Repubblica di San Marino, contenente le Indicazioni delle Opere pubblicate in varie Lingue*.

² See his papers in the *Atti e Memorie della R. Diputazione di Storia Patria per le Province di Romagna*, 3^a serie, VI. 260-349; VIII. 196-284; IX. 111-147; and his *L'Archivio Governativo della Repubblica di San Marino*.

legendary conflicts of Titans there or from a certain Titanus, or Tritanus, a soldier of Pompey's army, whose name is said to have been found there on a tomb in the sixteenth century. To this mountain Marinus may well have repaired, for he was a stone-mason by trade, and the quarries of Monte Titano still form one of the chief industries of the natives. On one of these visits he recognized that this secluded spot was just the place for a pious anchorite, and decided to establish himself there. I was shown the bed, hewn out of the rock, where he is supposed to have slept, and the whole place is naturally full of legends about him. His reputation for piety soon spread, and the Bishop of Rimini invited him to return to that city, and made him a deacon for his services in combating the heresies of the time. But he soon grew weary of the world, and went back to his hermitage, where he built a chapel for the use of the faithful, who had gathered around him. A wealthy matron named Felicissima, to whom the mountain and neighboring lands belonged, was converted by him and made him a present of those possessions, so that when he died he was able to tell his followers: *relinquo vos liberos ab utroque homine*, a phrase which has been interpreted to mean that he left them free from both political and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. His remains, carried off by the Lombard king Astolphus to Pavia, but restored by Pepin, now lie in the principal church of the Republic, whither they were transferred in 1628. Two guardians of the precious relics, called *Massai*, are annually appointed, and every year the festival of the saintly founder is celebrated.

It is clear from this story, that the Commonwealth of San Marino originated from a religious community, and the first authentic allusion to it which has come down to us is that of a monk, named Eugippius,¹ who flourished in the fifth or sixth century, and said that he had read the life of another monk, "who had once lived in the monastery of Monte Titano." The next apparent mention of the spot is contained in the work of the pseudo-Anastasius, who includes among the places comprised in Pepin's donation to the Pope a certain *Castellum S. Marini* or *S. Mariani*, or *S. Martini* (for the readings vary). The statement was of some importance, because it was subsequently used as a proof of the alleged rights of the Holy See over the Republic. But, even supposing the donation of Pepin to be genuine, there was no "castle" of S. Marino in that monarch's time on Monte Titano, so that another place must have been meant. Moreover, local antiquaries cite the proceedings

¹ Melchiorre Delfico, *Memorie Storiche di San Marino*, I. 11. Hauttecœur, *La République de San Marino*, 5, who quotes Canisius, *Antiquae Lectiones*, VI.

of a lawsuit between Deltone, bishop of Rimini, and Stephen, "priest and abbot" of S. Marino, in 885, to prove that the latter was living under a different legal system from that which prevailed at Rimini, and that therefore, not being governed by Roman law, San Marino could not have been included in Pepin's donation in 753.¹ The document, which has been preserved in the state archives, and is printed in full by Delfico, is known as the *placitum Feretranum*, because John, bishop of Montefeltro, was appointed to decide between the parties, and is the earliest which the Republic possesses. The next mention of the place is in a diploma of Berengarius II., King of the Lombards, who, fleeing before the victorious arms of the Emperor Otho, executed this document, *actum in plebe S. Marini*, in 951.²

The inhabitants, like those of other parts of Italy at that period, now began to fortify themselves by building the "castle," to which we have subsequent allusions in documents, and, as their numbers had increased, began, towards the end of the eleventh century, to extend their territory by purchase. Thus, they bought from the counts of Carpegna and the monastery of S. Gregorio the neighboring castle of Penna Rossa with its appurtenances, and the castle and property of Casole, while, much later, in the fourteenth century, the people of Busignano joined them for mutual protection. The *Borgo*, at the foot of the mountain on which the little capital stands, was founded, and a new form of government instituted. The original system seems to have consisted in an assembly of all heads of families known as *L'Arrengo*, which is still summoned at San Marino twice a year, but no longer retains the right of discussion. A new body, *Il Consiglio Generale*, which is mentioned in a document of 1253 as already existing, took the place of the *Arrengo*, and two officials were chosen from this Council every six months to preside over the Commonwealth. The first two of these "Consuls," as they were originally called, whose names have been preserved, were elected in 1224, and there is an almost complete list of them from that date. But in the statutes for 1295, the date at which Professor Malagola's collection of statutes begins,³ we find the names *capitaneus et defensor* substituted for those of *consules*. Towards the end of the fourteenth century, the terms of *capitanei seu rectores* are found, and now the two presidents are called *Capitani Reggenti*. The state thus organized received the name of *Libertas* for which that of

¹ Delfico, I. 15-19, and Fattori, *Ricordi Storici della Repubblica di S. Marino*, 14-15, collect the local opinions. For the text see Delfico, II. App.

² Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scripta*, I. pt. 2, p. 428.

³ But we have mention of a statute as early as 1253. Delfico, I. 41.

"Republic" was afterwards substituted. Such was the constitution of San Marino, when the conflict between Guelphs and Ghibellines devastated Italy in the thirteenth century. That the tiny republic should have escaped annexation by some of its neighbors seems almost miraculous, for it had numerous dangers to encounter from one or the other of them.

Its first risk was from the bishops of Montefeltro, its spiritual chiefs, one of whom, Ugolino by name, by inducing the Sammarinesi to espouse with him the Ghibelline cause, exposed them to the terrors of a papal interdict, which lay heavily upon their small state from 1247 to 1249, when they were released from it at Perugia. With the object of restoring peace to the rival factions in Romagna, Philip, archbishop of Ravenna, summoned a peace congress to the castle of San Marino in 1252, which however had no better result than an armistice for twenty days.¹

Ugolino, not content with his spiritual authority over the Republicans, clearly aimed at making himself master of a position so valuable as the castle of San Marino in those disturbed times. Thus, we find him participating in the purchase of some property which the Sammarinesi were anxious to acquire, in order to remove certain tolls levied by its owners upon all who visited an annual fair held in the neighborhood. His immediate successor followed his example in a similar transaction, and in 1278 expressed the "wish" that the Sammarinesi should alter a section in one of their statutes—a "wish" which they executed.² In a document of the previous year we find that the bishop had a residence in the strongest part of the city, and it was at San Marino that the famous Count Guido di Montefeltro, head of the Ghibellines in the Romagna, collected his partisans for an attempt on Rimini, at the invitation of a certain Messer Parcitade, chief of the same faction in that city. We are told that Parcitade, defeated by the Guelphs under Malatesta of Verucchio, fled to San Marino, where Guido greeted him with the sarcastic pun: *Ben venga, Mèsser Perdecittadi* ("Welcome, Mr. Lose-cities"). But that the state was not politically dependent upon the bishopric of Montefeltro is proved by two declarations of independence in the last decade of this thirteenth century. The former of them, dated 1291, arose out of a claim by the papal vicar of that district, who ordered the Sammarinesi to contribute towards the expenses of his office. The Sammarinesi refused, and the matter was submitted to the decision of a certain Palamede, judge at

¹ See the original document in Delfico, II. App.

² *De Voluntate Venerabilis Patris Domini Johannis . . . Episcopi Ferefrani*,—another allusion to statutes prior to 1295. Delfico, II. App.

Rimini, who came to Monte Titano, and decided in favor of its inhabitants on the ground that they were "free and exempt from any exterior suzerainty and rule whatsoever." A similar demand, made in 1296 by the "Podestà di Montefeltro," was referred by the natives to Pope Boniface VIII., who ordered an enquiry to be held. We have a long account of this enquiry, which was conducted on the spot by Ranieri, a neighboring abbot, and which forms a Great Charter of Sammarinese liberties. The witnesses, summoned before them, quoted Palamede's decision, and derived their liberties from Marinus himself. A Socratic dialogue ensued, the learned abbot trying to pose the simple mountaineers by pressing them for definitions of "liberty," to which they made excellent replies. But Uberto, bishop of Montefeltro, soon renewed these vexatious claims on San Marino, so that the inhabitants saw themselves compelled to take up arms in their own defence, first arresting some of his envoys on suspicion. They are mentioned as parties to the general pacification of the diocese, which was determined upon at the peace conference held at San Leo in 1300. But the next bishop, Benvenuto, adopted a more subtle line of attack. He asked permission at Rome in 1320 for the sale of the community, which he could not conquer, to the Malatesti, lords of Rimini. The contract was, however, never executed, and the Malatesti soon afterwards made peace with San Marino, although it had just lost its powerful friend, Frederico, count of Urbino, who was the victim of a popular tumult in the latter city. His relative, Speranza di Montefeltro, found a refuge among the Republicans, whose relations with the *Casa Feltria* had been as friendly as they were hostile with the bishops of Montefeltro. Yet, when their old enemy, Bishop Benvenuto, was an exile, they were so magnanimous as to receive him, too. His successor, for a pecuniary consideration, ceded to them all rights which he possessed, and the little land had a respite from troubles.

The citizens were now able to devote themselves to works of public utility. They built a hospital, and appointed a commission of experts to revise their statutes, the result of whose labors was published in 1353. But a new danger soon threatened this small community. Innocent VI., in his palace at Avignon, had resolved to restore the papal power in Italy, and despatched Cardinal Albornoz to subdue the Italian cities over which he claimed dominion. Albornoz, in the course of his career of conquest in the Romagna, found that the closest friendship existed between San Marino and the counts of Montefeltro, and in a treaty concluded with the latter, specially stipulated that the fortress of San Marino should remain under his own immediate control, until such time as the Malatesti

should submit to him. Delfico thinks that this article remained a dead letter,¹ as there are no traces of a foreign garrison on Monte Titano in the next few years ; but Albornoze made a demand for the payment of certain arrears due to the bishopric of Montefeltro, which was satisfactorily disposed of, thanks to the intervention of the ever-friendly counts. We hear, however, of fresh claims by the bishop of Montefeltro, which were not more successful than the others, and in 1368 that prelate visited San Marino, and protested that he claimed to exercise no temporal authority there. An even clearer proof of San Marino's independence is to be found in the account of the place and its government in the *Descriptio* of the province of Romagna, drawn up in 1371 by the successor of Albornoze, Cardinal Anglicus Grimoaldi, and in one of the same cardinal's letters.² "They do not admit," he writes, "the power of the Church, nor anyone exercising jurisdiction in its name ; they govern themselves, and administer their own justice in civil and criminal matters." But in 1375 a traitor, Giacomo Pelizzaro, acting at the instigation of the bishop and the *podestà* of Montefeltro, plotted to betray his country, and was executed by the two heads of the community. He was one of the few traitors in all the fifteen and a half centuries of San Marino's history. Nothing of much interest occurred during the next three decades. The fortifications were completed, and a forger was sentenced to death. Pope Gregory XII., by arriving at Rimini during the papal schism in 1408, caused the citizens some alarm lest they should embrace the losing side in that great dispute ; but the Pope did not seek refuge, as at one time seemed probable, on the rocks of Monte Titano. Some years later the Malatesti accused them of having granted the famous *condottiere*, Braccio, a passage through their territory, and such was their alarm, that they temporarily suspended their constitution and appointed a dictator. And, when Braccio turned his arms against their benefactor, Guido, count of Urbino, they ran the risk of being attacked by him. So close did their relations with Urbino become, that the count granted them in 1440 exemption from all dues on any property which they possessed in his territory, and a letter is preserved in the archives in which he writes to them that, if he had "only a single crust of bread," he would share it with them.

The next period in the history of the republic was the most warlike which it has ever known. In this same year it took part in the war between Count Guido and Sigismondo Malatesta, with such success that at the peace of 1441 the latter was compelled to pay it an indemnity by remitting the taxes due to him by those Repub-

¹ I. 94.² Text in Hautteccœur, 69-71 ; Delfico, I. 103-104.

licans who had property in his territory. But on Guido's death, Sigismondo endeavored to surprise San Marino by a night attack, which was only averted by means of a timely warning sent to the inhabitants by Guido's successor, Oddo Antonio. A fresh attempt was made in 1449 to bribe some of the citizens, but on this occasion, as before, the plot was discovered, and the principal traitor executed. But the turn of the Republicans to take vengeance on Malatesta soon came. Alfonso of Aragon, King of Naples, who had a quarrel with him, had no difficulty in persuading them through his generalissimo, Frederico, the new count of Urbino, to join in war against the lord of Rimini. A cautious Sammarinese did, indeed, remind his fellow countrymen, much as Onofri reminded them in the time of Bonaparte, that "wars end, but neighbors remain." But the offences of Malatesta rankled in their breasts, and in 1458 they signed a treaty of alliance with the King. Still, at the eleventh hour, they seem to have become alarmed, and endeavored to stand well with both parties. Their diplomacy and the operations of their allies were successful, and the Sammarinesi received the castle of Fiorentino, which had long threatened them, and which still forms part of their territory, though it has long been dismantled. Four years later the war was renewed at the instigation of Pope Pius II., who urged the faithful Republicans to attack Malatesta, and made them vague promises of territorial compensation, which they were too wary to believe without some more definite arrangement. The Pope accordingly sent a confidential envoy to make a definite agreement with the republic, which was concluded on September 21, 1462, and provided "that the hamlet of Fiorentino, with the castles of Montegiardino and Serravalle and their appurtenances," should be given to San Marino.¹

These places, together with the castle of Faetano, which had voluntarily joined it, were in 1463, actually added to the republic, as a reward for its vigorous part in the campaign, and are still integral parts of it. "These," says the local historian, Fattori, "are the last acquisitions which the government of San Marino made. From that time the republic has not grown by so much as an inch of land, and, content with its modest frontiers, has never sought to extend them."² The complete downfall of the Malatesti, as the result of this struggle, freed the Republicans from danger on the side of Rimini, and the rest of the fifteenth century was the golden age of San Marino. The Florentines wrote to their "dearest friends," the men of San Marino, and the latter were courageous enough to join in opposing by force Pope Paul II.'s design of an-

¹ Documents in Delfico, II. App.

² Fattori, 37.

nexing Rimini to the Papal States. Availing themselves of the peace which then reigned in the Romagna, the Sammarinesi made, in 1491, a second revision of their statutes, forbidding any citizen, on pain of death, to invoke foreign aid, or to alienate his property to foreign potentates, ordering that traitors should be drawn to execution at the tail of an ass, and annulling the ancient exception which forbade war against the Church. It seems probable that the style of "Republic" had been adopted early in this century, as we find it used as far back as 1448, but Fattori places between 1491 and 1505 the institution of the "Council of Twelve," a body still extant, two-thirds of which are annually elected from the "Council of Sixty," and which possesses certain judicial functions. To the fifteenth century, too, belong several notable natives of this miniature state, such as Giovanni Bertholdi di Serravalle, the theologian, and commentator on Dante, whose work has been published at the expense of the present Pope.

But the sixteenth century began badly for the Republicans. Caesar Borgia's career of conquest in the Romagna filled them with just alarm; and after the fall of the duchy of Urbino at his hands, they sent envoys to Venice, offering to obey the republic of San Marco, rather than the cruel son of Pope Alexander VI., and begging the Venetian government to send them a commissioner. The Venetians declined the overtures of the sister republic, which for a few months in 1503 was actually occupied by the officials of Caesar Borgia. At the first favorable moment, however, the Sammarinesi rose and drove out their tyrants; but the Republican village of Serravalle, which Caesar had released from its allegiance to San Marino, was not anxious to return to it. The Sammarinesi then joined in the Romagnole revolt against Caesar, and we find their commander, Giangi, writing to the *Capitani Reggenti* for a flag, so that he might conquer under the banner of the republic. The death of Alexander VI. and the fall of the Borgia family saved the little state from further danger from that quarter. But a new neighbor appeared on the scene in the shape of the Venetian republic, which had purchased Rimini from the Malatesti. Fortunately for San Marino, the new pope, Julius II., was uncle of Francesco Maria della Rovere, who, on the recent extinction of the house of Montefeltro, had become duke of Urbino, and was animated by friendly feelings for the republic of Monte Titano. Accordingly, the Sammarinesi turned to the Pope in their distress, and he wrote to them in 1509, assuring them that he had "resolved to omit nothing that could be of service for their defence and safety."¹

¹ His letter is in the archives, and is given by Delfico, II. App.

It has even been asserted by some writers, that the Pope was entertained at San Marino during his campaign against Venice.¹ At any rate, the Sammarinesi profited by his victory, and shortly afterward gave a double proof of their independence by refusing to give up to the duke of Urbino certain fugitives from Rimini, and by receiving the inhabitants of San Leo when they were driven out from that place by Lorenzo de' Medici. Under date of 1516, the archives contain a letter from Lorenzo, assuring the republic of his friendship and protection, which was confirmed by a document from Pope Leo X. During the disputes that raged around them at this period, the Sammarinesi preserved a wise and diplomatic neutrality which disarmed hostility.

In 1543 the republic nearly lost its liberty forever. On the night of June 4 a certain Fabiano da Monte attempted to surprise San Marino with a force of over 500 men. Fortunately, the two columns into which this force was divided arrived late at the rendezvous, so that day dawned before they could begin the attack. A great hubbub arose out of this affair; the duke of Urbino, Cosimo of Florence, and the envoys of the Emperor Charles V. in Italy, offered their aid to the little republic, and diligent efforts were made to discover the real authors of the plot. Fattori, who wrote an essay on this question,² inclined to the opinion that Pope Paul III. was at the bottom of it, his object being to convert San Marino into a principality for his son, Pier Luigi, and that a French agent, Strozzi, had arranged the plan of campaign. The salvation of the republic was piously attributed to its patron and founder, and from this epoch Marinus is represented (like San Biagio at Ragusa) as holding in his hands the territory of the commonwealth, while the fourth of June is still kept as a festival, in commemoration of the event. The Pope seems to have become convinced by the scandal caused by this attempt, that the liberties of San Marino were not to be infringed, for we find him writing six years later to threaten with condign punishment all who should transgress the rights of the republic. But in the same year in which he wrote, a new attempt was made on the place by Leonardo Pio, lord of the neighboring castle of Verrucchio; this plot was foiled by the intervention of the duke of Urbino, with whom the republic signed a treaty of defence. The text of this treaty is preserved in the archives, and is one of the most striking proofs of the secular friendship which existed between the rulers of Urbino and the com-

¹ Hautteceur, 105 n., alludes to this, but Gregorovius does not mention it.

² *Sul Tentativo di Fabiano da Monte San Salvino*, in the *Atti e Memorie della R. Diputazione di Storia Patria per le Provincie di Romagna*, 1889.

monwealth. In the following year, the town of San Marino was thoroughly fortified by one of its most distinguished citizens, Giambattista Belluzzi, author of a work on fortifications, and the present town walls are memorials of his skill. Encouraged by these evidences of their own strength and by the ducal protection, the Sammarinesi indignantly rejected the summons sent to their captains to appear before the papal throne to answer charges made against them by one of their fellow-citizens. We have already mentioned that the statutes forbade the appeal of a citizen to any foreign power, and, on the present occasion, the government of the republic not only punished the appellant, but firmly declined to admit any rights of jurisdiction outside of their own frontiers.

The latter half of the sixteenth century began, however, to mark a decline in the fortunes of the republic. The public spirit of the community became weaker, the administration of justice was defective, and the great famine of 1591 added a final blow to the sorely tried state. The members of the Council of Sixty neglected their duties to such an extent that a quorum was frequently lacking, and the delays in drawing up a new and much-wanted code of laws were so flagrant that, weary of waiting, the government gave binding force to a compilation, made by a learned Sammarinese, Camillo Bonelli, who, like the most eminent citizens of that period, sought for a wider field for his abilities abroad. There were able men, even in that dark age, who sprang from the soil of Monte Titano, but their talents were usually devoted to the service of other governments. Characteristically enough, as the republic declined in moral force, it added to the splendor of its titles. The Council of Sixty began at this time to style itself *Il Principe* and to describe itself as "most illustrious," and the custom of conferring the honorary citizenship upon foreigners, a custom still prevalent, was introduced. Thus in 1568 we find Antonio Cerri admitted as an honorary citizen, while literary merit was thus rewarded in the person of Zuccoli, author of a quaint dialogue on San Marino, called *Il Belluzzi*, or *Della Città Felice*; for, despite its decline, San Marino still seemed a "happy city" to outsiders in that distracted age.

The seventeenth century opened with the dark prospect that ere long the republic would lose its traditional allies by the death of Francesco Maria II. of Urbino without an heir and the consequent lapse of his duchy to the Holy See. The last duke did not, indeed, die till 1631, but before his death negotiations were made with Urban VIII., who took the republic under his protection, at the same time guaranteeing its liberty and respecting its jurisdiction. From this date San Marino was surrounded on all sides by papal

territory and a long period of peace ensued. But, though free from external dangers, the Republicans continued to be beset by the internal troubles to which allusion has already been made. The difficulty of obtaining a quorum now became so great that in 1652 the number of councillors was reduced from sixty to forty-five. Even at the present date, as Captain Gozi informed me in 1899, it is not easy to find suitable persons for all the offices out of a total population of about nine thousand. In the middle of the seventeenth century it was harder still, owing to the lack of education, which was remedied in 1691 by the foundation of the Belluzzi College. Two other evils are especially mentioned as causes of San Marino's decay, —the maladministration of justice, owing to the fear of giving offence to other members of so small a community, and the increased number of outlaws who had taken refuge there. The former was removed by the common practice of other Italian states, that of substituting for the two captains, in respect to their judicial functions, three foreign judges, elected for the term of three years, a system which still survives. A special law was passed in 1654 to prevent the abuse of the right of asylum, but was of short duration, and in our own days this has been the gravest danger to the independence of San Marino. The once austere republicans, too, became infected with the desire for titles, and in 1646 we find the first mention of a noble caste, which exists at the present time, when there are twenty noble families, and one captain must always be a noble. One noteworthy distinction of that century must not be forgotten, the publication of the first history of San Marino, by Matteo Valli, secretary of the republic.¹

The next noteworthy incident in the history of the state was the visit of Addison in the spring of 1701, to which Macaulay alludes in his essay on that eminent man. In his *Remarks on Several Parts of Italy*, Addison has left us some interesting observations on "the smallest independent state in Europe." "It may boast," he wrote, "at least of a nobler origin than that of Rome: the one having been at first an asylum for robbers and murderers, the other of persons eminent for piety and devotion," and he added that "nothing indeed can be a greater instance of the natural love that mankind has for liberty, and of their aversion to arbitrary government, than such a savage mountain covered with people, and the Campagna of Rome almost destitute of inhabitants."

The threat of a foreign occupation in the first half of the eighteenth century once more raised the long downcast spirit of repub-

¹ *Relazione dell' Origine e Governo della Repubblica di San Marino*. Padova, 1633; reprinted in 1733.

lican liberty on Monte Titano. Two Sammarinesi, in opposition for personal reasons with the government, started an agitation for the abolition of the law, passed in the previous century, for the restriction of the number of councillors to forty-five. They complained of the aristocratic tendencies of this Venetian oligarchy, and demanded the restoration of the ancient *Arrengo* of all heads of families, threatening to throw the councillors out of window if their demands were not granted. The two ring-leaders were arrested and put in prison, but their confederates appealed to the famous cardinal Alberoni, at that time legate of the Romagna, on the ground that one of the prisoners had been seized in a church, and that the other possessed a privilege from the holy house of Loreto which exempted him from any other jurisdiction. Alberoni was glad of an excuse for intervention; he wrote to Pope Clement XII., depicting San Marino as a nest of tyrants and miscreants, stating that some of its inhabitants desired annexation to the Papal States, and pointing out that if so strong a position were allowed to fall into the hands of a powerful prince it might be a source of danger to the Holy Father. At the same time, he arrested two leading Sammarinesi, who were on papal territory, and forbade the importation of provisions into the republic. The Pope replied that Alberoni was to go near the Republican frontier, and there await the petition of the majority and more intelligent part of the inhabitants for annexation; should they, however, not desire it, he was to return home and leave them in peace. Accordingly, on October 17, 1739, Alberoni occupied first Serravalle, and then the Borgo. Giangi, one of the captains, at once gave the order to close both of the gates of the city; but the appearance of a number of suspicious-looking countrymen and the persuasions of his colleague induced him to allow the cardinal to enter. Alberoni and the traitors in league with him introduced his soldiers, and in the evening the city was in their power, and the fortress besieged. One of the most intrepid Republicans cried aloud: *Viva la Repubblica*, as he was dragged off to prison. The cardinal raised the members of the council to sixty, naming fifteen new Councillors among his partisans, substituted a *Gonfaloniere* and two *Conservatori* for the two captains, and ordered the Councillors to meet in the principal church on the 25th, in order to take the oath to the Pope. On the appointed day the cardinal took his seat on the throne of the captains, and called upon the *Gonfaloniere* to take the oath first. He did so, but the heroic Giangi, whose turn it was next, refused to swear. "On the first of October,"¹ he said, "I swore fidelity to

¹ It is on October 1 and April 1 that the captains come into office.

my lawful prince, the Republic of San Marino ; this oath I now confirm, and thus I swear." The next two touched the book without a word, but the fifth, Giuseppe Onofri, said that, while he was ready to take the oath if the Pope absolutely insisted thereon, he would, if His Holiness left him the choice, swear to be ever faithful to San Marino. At these words, the church resounded with shouts of *Erviva la Repubblica*, and another local hero, pointing to the head of Marinus, exposed on the altar, cried aloud : " Long live San Marino ! Long live liberty ! " Alberoni, finding that his friends were in a minority, addressed an impassioned discourse to the people, telling them that he had come to free them from tyranny, not to deprive them of their freedom. His oration availed nothing, and the popular indignation became so threatening that he quitted the church, and ordered the pillage of the houses of the five leading "rebels." This cowed the people in the church, and in the evening, overcome by hunger, they swore. A few days later, Alberoni withdrew, leaving a governor and a considerable force behind him. But the cardinal's triumph was of short duration. The Republicans laid their case before the Pope, and the French ambassador threatened the Holy Father with an ultimatum from Louis XV. in the event of his refusal to grant their request. Clement XII. sent Monsignor Enriquez to inquire on the spot into the condition of San Marino ; and, as the result of his investigations, on February 5, 1740, the Republic was formally restored, and the day is still kept as an annual festival. Alberoni had to content himself with publishing a *Manifesto Storico-politico-apologetico sulla Conquista del Titano*, to which Cardinal Corsini replied.¹

Eight years later, Benedict XIV. confirmed the independence of the Republic.

The attempt of Alberoni had an excellent effect on the Republicans. They restored the old Council of Sixty in its entirety, and forgot their private quarrels. They had no further difficulties to face until 1786, when the Legate of Ravenna blockaded them for six months, in consequence of their punishment of a certain lawyer who had appealed to Rome. Pope Pius VI. took their side, and gave orders for the cessation of the blockade. Four years later, Cardinal Chiaramonti saved the Republic by a timely warning from being seized by the Freemasons.

Then came the gravest crisis in the history of the state. In 1797 Bonaparte reached Pesaro, and it might have been imagined that the great conquerer would not spare San Marino. Asked

¹ The best work on Alberoni's occupation is Malagola's *Il Cardinale Alberoni e la Repubblica di San Marino*, published in 1889.

what he intended to do with it, he replied : *Conservons-la comme un échantillon de république*. He despatched Monge to San Marino to assure the government of "the fraternity and affection of the French Republic," and his envoy, in a high-flown speech, still preserved in the archives, offered them provisions, cannon and an extension of frontier. Fortunately, the Republicans had at that time as one of their captains Antonio Onofri, a descendant of the Onofri of Alberoni's day, and the wisest of all these peasant statesmen. Onofri politely declined in their name any territorial aggrandizement, and this refusal saved the republic after the fall of Napoleon. The latter, on Monge's return, wrote them an affable letter, in which he promised freedom from contributions to all their citizens in any part of the French Republic, and a few years later Onofri was able to obtain a treaty of commerce with the Cisalpine Republic. When in 1805 Napoleon assumed the iron crown at Milan, Onofri was received in audience by him with great affability. Eugène de Beauharnais and Murat treated San Marino with equal favor, and the only effect which the revolutionary wave had upon the republic was the abolition of the order of nobility in 1797; even this was restored three years later, so that the commonwealth emerged from the turmoil of the Napoleonic period intact.

All went well with San Marino until 1823, when a violent attack upon the state and its government was circulated in Rome with the same object which had animated Alberoni's libels. Leo XII., the new Pope, had never loved the republic, and it needed the good offices of various foreign diplomatists before Onofri could obtain an audience of the pontiff. At last Leo yielded, and wrote an affectionate letter to the captains, assuring them of his friendship and renewing the ancient conventions with them. Charles X. of France, Louis Philippe, Pius VIII., Metternich, and the Austrian emperor Ferdinand¹ all wrote amiable letters to the little republic, and Chateaubriand declared that, if he was "a monarchist in France," he was "a republican at San Marino." The disturbances of 1831 and 1845 in the Romagna led to the extension of the Commonwealth's traditional hospitality to some of the conspirators, but the most serious affair of this kind was the sudden arrival of Garibaldi at San Marino, when, after the fall of the Roman Republic of 1849, he was on his way with his wife, Ugo Bassi, and his devoted band of followers, from Rome to Ravenna. It was on July 31 of that year that he entered the gate, to the consternation of the captains, and informed them that, hard pressed by the Austrians, he had entered the Republican territory in order to have "bread and rest."

¹ Delfico, III. App.

He added: "Here we will lay down our arms; here shall cease the war of Italian independence." The senior captain replied that he had ordered rations to be prepared for the Garibaldians, and that he would intercede with the Austrian commander, the Archduke Ernst, on their behalf. The archduke would hear at first of nothing but an unconditional surrender, but subsequently contented himself with demanding Garibaldi's exile to America. To this the great leader would not agree; early in the morning he wrote to the captains a laconic letter, still treasured in the Sammarinese archives, saying: "The conditions imposed on me by the Austrians are unacceptable, and therefore we shall evacuate your territory." He then quitted San Marino, and, thanks to the aid of a Sammarinese, Nicola Zani, who was still alive when I was at San Marino in 1899, made his way through the Austrian lines. Those of his followers who had not gone with him but remained outside the city at first threatened to man the fortifications and hold the place against all comers. But the natives closed the gates and prepared to defend themselves. At last the Garibaldians all laid down their arms, and received from the captains passports and two *paoli* (1 s. 8 d.) each. The Austrians were then invited to take up their quarters in the Republican territory, and the archduke made his temporary abode in the house of Borghesi, the famous numismatist, who (like the historian, Delfico, at an earlier period) lived for years an honored citizen of San Marino. No one ever compensated the little republic for its expenses on the occasion of Garibaldi's visit, but the government was thankful to escape, even with some pecuniary loss, the danger of being placed between the Austrian hammer and the Garibaldian anvil.¹

Two years later, however, the Austrian and papal forces surrounded the Republican territory, and demanded the surrender of all foreigners who had taken refuge there. The government invited the Austrians to come and search for themselves, and they did so. Pius IX., unfavorably disposed to the Apennine Republic for the shelter it had given to the Roman Republicans, took further advantage of the assassination of the Secretary of State and two other persons to suggest a joint occupation by the papal and Tuscan forces. Napoleon III., however, put his veto on this proceeding, and sent an envoy to study the state of affairs and offer the protection, and, if

¹ See on this subject, Brizi, *Le Bande Garibaldine a S. Marino*; Modoni, *Sul Titano*; Franciosi, *Garibaldi e la Repubblica di S. Marino*; Simoncini, *G. Garibaldi e Ugo Bassi in San Marino* (by the keeper of the café, where they stayed); and the *Numero Unico*, published on the opening of the New Palace in 1894, which contains much curious matter. Also, *Pall Mall Gazette*, July 31, 1899.

need be, the sword of France to the republic, which declined armed assistance, but gratefully acknowledged the offer of the Emperor. After the creation of the Italian kingdom, he was the first to recognize the continued independence of San Marino. With Italy the republic concluded a commercial treaty in 1862, which has since been renewed every ten years. The Italian Government has a consul there, and the Republic has representatives in several Italian towns, as well as in Paris. In 1864, separate money of San Marino was minted, which has currency in Italy. It is almost all copper, but one of the rare silver pieces is in the collection of King Vittorio Emanuele III. Stamps have become a favorite source of revenue among the Republicans, as they are eagerly bought up by collectors, and the usual devices of changing the colors and surcharging the stamps have been adopted to increase the number of issues. From 1877, when the first stamps came out, till the present time, there have been about seventy postal issues in all, and the last plan was to publish separate stamps for internal use in San Marino's miniature territory! Another means of raising money, the sale of titles, has proved profitable since the creation of an equestrian order in 1859. Dukedoms, baronies and the like are cheap at San Marino, and it is sufficient to present a statue to the state, or even in some cases to write a book about it, in order to become a noble personage. A more dubious source of gain, a gaming-table, was declined in 1868, despite the offers of a company, and San Marino has no newspapers, no railway, and very light taxes.

Its good relations with Italy, largely due to the exertions of Cibrario, a satellite of Cavour, have continued with the single exception of a difficult crisis, which arose in 1874, owing to the old grievance, the abuse of the right of asylum. For three months a cordon surrounded San Marino, but at last it was removed. It was on this occasion that the Italian consulate was founded there. Since that date the chief events have been the inauguration of the new and splendid Government Palace in 1894, when the poet Carducci attended and eulogized the "perpetual liberty" of the state; the financial crisis of 1898, caused by an organized pillage of the National Bank by the cashier; and the extradition treaty between Great Britain and San Marino in 1899.¹ This was the first instance of official relations between the two countries; the British consul-general at Florence was appointed to represent Queen Victoria at San Marino, and in October 1900 a special mission, of which Mr. LeQueux, the novelist, formed part, visited the Republic for the final and formal completion of the treaty.

¹ *Times*, April 18, 1900.

Such are the main facts of San Marino's long history. The causes of its preservation during more than fifteen centuries are to be found in the protection which it obtained, first from the Montefeltro family, then from their successors in the duchy of Urbino, and then, after the extinction of that duchy, from the Popes. No doubt the tact of these peasant statesmen, and their shrewdness in declining offers of territory at the expense of their neighbors, was also of inestimable service to the state ; while the poverty of Monte Titano made it not worth plundering. So, alone of the Italian republics, San Marino still exists, "a pattern," as Napoleon I. said, of a mediæval commonwealth, with all those aristocratic arrangements by which those oligarchies were governed. Like Andorra, she remains as an interesting survival, and, as such, will probably be allowed to live on uninjured.

WILLIAM MILLER.

THE RISINGS IN THE ENGLISH MONASTIC TOWNS IN 1327

IN comparing the municipal history of England with that of the Continent, during the Middle Ages, several important points of difference suggest themselves. One of these, and perhaps the most striking, is that in English towns as a general rule there were few such fierce party struggles as occur, for example, in the history of even the smallest German city. The democratic character of English municipal government prevented, save in rare instances, any oppression by powerful patricians, or the formation of bitterly hostile factions in the town. In addition, the royal prerogative in England was too potent and far-reaching to allow of any such disorders.¹ But the municipal history of England, nevertheless, is not altogether devoid of a series of factional conflicts. The history of one class of English towns is for over three centuries the history of long and bitter struggles, and violence and bloodshed fill their annals. The class of towns referred to is the monastic class, those under monastic control, and the struggles are those which were made by the townsmen to obtain liberties and franchises from their lords.

The status of the English monastic towns was a peculiar one. They were not full-fledged boroughs, according to the best authorities of to-day, nor can they be relegated, save in a few exceptional cases, to the rank of mere market-towns or manors.² Most of them were free boroughs by royal charter, but they were under the close and constant control of the abbot or prior of the monastery in their midst.³ The chief concern of the burgesses was to lessen this control, and to win for themselves the right of complete self-government, owing allegiance to the royal authority alone. Naturally enough, the monks withstood all such demands for greater

¹ Gross, *Gild Merchant*, I. 106, 285; Hegel, *Städte und Gilden*, p. 114. There are, it is true, a few examples of party strife in English towns, especially in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, for which see C. W. Colby, *The Growth of Oligarchy in English Towns*, in the *English Historical Review*, 1890.

² Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, I. 407-409, 425-426; Pollock and Maitland, *History of English Law*, I. 641-642; Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 217.

³ For pictures of life in a monastic town see: Carlyle, *Past and Present* (Abbot Sampson of Bury St. Edmunds); Froude, *Annals of an English Abbey* (St. Albans), in *Short Studies*; Green, *Abbot and Town in Studies in England and Italy*; and Cornhill *Magazine*, VI. 858.

liberty, and during the thirteenth century, and in the opening years of the fourteenth, there were serious conflicts between the antagonistic forces of monasticism and communalism.¹

It was, however, at the beginning of Edward III.'s reign that the crisis in the struggle came, and the year 1327 is marked by the number of risings which then took place. The political and social conditions in England during the latter part of Edward II.'s reign were deplorable, and the tendency to turmoil and rebellion was everywhere apparent throughout the realm. Especially was this the case in monastic towns and manors, and with the deposition of the weak king and the accession of his young son everything seemed favorable to an outbreak. The central power was weak and ineffective, and the whole country was in a state of lawlessness. It was not strange, therefore, that the burgesses in several of the most important monastic towns rose in open revolt, and seized the opportunity presented to throw off the yoke of their lords, and that they made a violent and long sustained effort towards liberty. In their struggle they were encouraged, no doubt, by the bold stand against the royal power made, at this time, by the citizens of London, emissaries from whom, in several cases, even came and invited the men of other towns to revolt against their lords.² So general, in fact, does the movement seem to have been, that one of the most reliable of the St. Albans chroniclers, in speaking of the troubles that took place there, informs us that the townsmen, in rising against the abbot and convent, were following the example of the communities of cities, boroughs and towns, which, acting with unbridled audacity, endeavored to extort charters and liberties from their lords.³ The contemporary evidence of widespread disorder and rebellions seems to warrant such a statement, for everywhere throughout England there were disturbances and risings, though it is only with several of the chief risings in the monastic towns that this article aims to deal.

One of the most violent outbreaks took place in the town of St. Albans in Hertfordshire. There had already been half a century of conflict there between abbey and town, and the burgesses were eager and ready for a fresh revolt of an even more violent nature than any of the preceding ones. The *inferiores*, or lower class of townsmen, banded themselves together by oath to resist the abbot,

¹ Mrs. J. R. Green, *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century*, II. Chap. 9; Thompson, *Essay on Municipal History*, pp. 20 ff.

² *Gesta Abbatum Sancti Albani*, R. S., II. 156.

³ "Quorum sequentes exemplum, civitatum, burgorum et villarum communitates, et irrefrenatam assumentes audaciam chartas et libertates . . . a dominis suis per vim et violentiam extorquere nitebantur." Walsingham, *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 156.

being encouraged in this by several of the Londoners sent to St. Albans for this purpose. The *majores*, or better class of townsmen, pretended to be on the side of the abbot, yet, secretly, they encouraged and aided the malcontents. Just on the eve of the outbreak the Earl of Lancaster came to St. Albans with a powerful retinue. The *majores*, afraid for the success of their plans, sent a deputation of twelve burgesses to the abbot begging him neither to mention the sworn league nor to make any complaint to the earl. They, on their part, promised to see to it that matters in dispute would proceed peaceably and by way of law. Relying on these assurances the abbot allowed the earl to depart without asking his aid against the rebelliously minded townsmen.¹

The next day saw the opening of hostilities on the part of the townsmen, and proved how fallacious the abbot's trust in their promises had been. A servant of the abbot being attacked and pursued by the mob, in the streets of the town, slew one of his adversaries and escaped. Thereupon the townsmen rose *en masse* to assert their liberties. They erected a scaffold in the market-place and attaching an axe to it by a chain, they declared that all who were unwilling to join them should be beheaded there.² On the morrow the same twelve townsmen, who had so earnestly besought the abbot not to call on the earl for assistance, came to him again, and, in the name of the community of St. Albans, they asked him to grant them certain rights and liberties contained in the petition which they presented. This petition consisted of seven articles, and the demands made show clearly what it was that the burgesses in most ecclesiastical towns struggled for so fiercely. The first article asked for a general restoration of charters and liberties, of which the townsmen believed themselves to have been deprived and for proof of which they appealed to the Domesday record. They wished to be "as free as any borough or burgesses." Then, in the articles following, they went on to ask for the restoration of certain specific rights which they declared that they had formerly enjoyed. They wished to be allowed to send two burgesses, elected by themselves, to represent them in Parliament; also to respond by twelve burgesses, without a commixture of outsiders, before the justices in eyre; to take the assize of bread and beer in the town through twelve of their own number; to have the right of common in lands, woods, waters, fish-ponds and other privileged places, as was contained in Domesday; to have hand-mills for grinding their corn, and to be indemnified for the losses they had sustained through being de-

¹ *Gesta Abbatum*, R. S., II. 156-157.

² *Ibid.*, "ut qui nollent consentire illorum molitionibus, ibidem capite plecterentur."

prived of them ; and, finally, they demanded that the town-bailiff should make all executions in the town without being interfered with by the bailiff of the abbot's liberty or any other person.¹

The abbot would not immediately concede what the townsmen demanded, but requested a delay of four days in which to consider the matter. The townsmen were, however, so impatient that they would allow him but one day, and as soon as that had expired they appeared with the articles again and demanded an immediate answer. A verbal consent to the articles was all that they could extort from the abbot, and the deputies retired in great indignation. With a wise foresight the abbot had retained the services of two hundred armed men, as a garrison for the monastery. Then when the evening came and the townsmen attacked the abbey at one of the chief gates they were repulsed by the forces within. Then followed a ten days' siege ; but the inmates being well supplied with water and provisions, and all attempts to assault being met and repulsed, the townsmen got little satisfaction. Finally a royal writ was procured to be issued to the sheriff of Hertfordshire bidding him, if necessary, to levy the *posse comitatus* and relieve the abbey and its inmates. The king's peace was to be proclaimed in the town, and all who afterwards resisted were to be arrested and imprisoned. The townsmen dared not resist the royal proclamation, and quietly dispersed to their homes. They still held to their purpose of obtaining borough liberties, however, and their sworn confederation was maintained, as in London and other towns.²

Legal measures were next resorted to by the townsmen to gain recognition of their liberties, and they engaged lawyers to urge, in the royal court, their grievances against the abbot, who for his part took similar action. It looked as if the matters in dispute would be peaceably settled by the royal justices. The townsmen evidently feared the outcome of such a suit, and arranged instead to have a conference, to settle the differences, held in St. Paul's Churchyard some weeks later. Such dilatory proceedings did not appeal to the rabble of St. Albans, however, and while negotiations were pending between the abbot and the better class of burgesses, a fresh outbreak occurred in the town. The abbey was attacked but the rioters were again repulsed, and one of their number captured and thrown into prison. In London, meanwhile, things

¹ The full text of this interesting petition from the burgesses can be seen in the *Gesta Abbatum S. Albani*, R. S., II. 157-158. These do not seem to have been excessive demands on the part of the townsmen, but they had never enjoyed them in the past, as they claimed to have done.

² *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 159-160, where the royal writs to the sheriff are given in full.

seemed to be going in favor of the townsmen. A writ was issued in their favor, in which the abbot and his bailiffs were blamed for depriving the burgesses of their liberties, contrary to Magna Charta,¹ and were forbidden to further molest them in the enjoyment of their rights.²

Another writ was issued to the Treasurer and Chamberlain directing them to inspect the Domesday Book to find whether or not the town of St. Albans should be a free borough and the men of the town free burgesses. The result of such an inspection showed clearly and conclusively that the town belonged to the abbey, for the forty-six burgesses mentioned therein all held from the abbot, and owned but half a hide collectively. This was a decided setback to the claims of the townsmen.³

The next step was the conference in St. Paul's Churchyard, where, after some discussion, twelve arbitrators were agreed on: knights, lawyers and men from the country around St. Albans. These undertook to consider the demands of the townsmen for greater liberties, and were aided in their deliberation by three nobles from the royal council. After long debate an indenture was drawn up by the arbitrators, which was more favorable to the townsmen than to the abbot, but the final composition was put off until later. The events up to this point had occupied the first three months of 1327 and now, on the sixth of March, the parties met in the Abbey Church at St. Albans to agree to a final composition. The abbot and convent solemnly produced the charter granted to them by Henry II., which confirmed them in possession of the town of St. Albans, with a market and every liberty which a borough ought to have.⁴ The word *burgus* in the charter roused the interest of all the townsmen present, and they immediately demanded to have the status of burgesses confirmed to them under the sign and seal of the convent. The monks hesitated and held back, and the matter was postponed for four days, so that it could be discussed before the royal council and the wiser heads of the realm at Westminster.⁵ At this important conference the abbot and convent were represented by three monks and a professor of civil law. After many disputes and

¹ Magna Charta, section 13: "Praeterea volumus et concedimus quod omnes aliae civitates, et burgi, et villae, et portus, habeant omnes libertates et liberas consuetudines suas."

² *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 161.

³ *Ibid.*, II. 162-163; for the entry in *Domesday Book* concerning St. Albans see *D. B.*, p. 132.

⁴ *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 164. This charter of Henry II.'s seems to have been the only one of importance possessed by the abbot and convent who, no doubt, relied largely on prescriptive right.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II. 165.

controversies, both parties consented to an indenture, or agreement, of the following nature. Twenty-four of the more faithful townsmen of St. Albans were to be chosen to make a perambulation of the town limits, and after considering and noting the ancient boundaries they were to report the result to the abbot and convent. These, on their part, agreed to confirm, by their common seal, such boundaries, having first given seisin of them, to the burgesses of the town.¹

The perambulation was accordingly made, and the indenture between the abbot and the burgesses drawn up. The royal assent and confirmation were given on April 19, the burgesses making fine of forty shillings,² and it only remained to get the abbot and convent to set their seal to the agreement. The burgesses brought to bear every possible pressure, but the monks delayed and were unwilling. A royal mandate came to them ordering them to confirm the agreement,³ yet they were bitterly opposed to any concession, and at a meeting in the church of St. Albans there was great opposition to sealing the document. Headed by their archdeacon the monks drew up a solemn protest against the conventual seal being used. It was in vain that the timid and terrified old abbot, Hugh of Everisdene, displayed the royal mandate. The monks, though greatly alarmed, still maintained their resolute attitude and left the chapter-house without yielding. It was only through the urgent entreaties of their abbot, and the imminent danger in which they were placed, that they at length gave in and allowed the convent seal to be used. A protest was, indeed, drawn up and recorded before two notaries public, which declared that this concession was made through fear of violence and not of their own free will.⁴

The indenture, thus won from the abbot and convent, and confirmed by the King, was a document of great importance to the burgesses of St. Albans. It set forth the metes and bounds of the borough in detail. St. Albans was henceforth to be a borough, without dispute; all tenements were to be burghage tenements; and all the inhabitants, their heirs and successors, were declared to be burgesses. Two burgesses were to be elected to represent the town in parliament, and twelve before the itinerant justices. The townsmen were, however, bound to appear at the abbot's hundred court, when summoned by writ, as formerly. The assize of bread and ale, and all articles having to do with the assize, were hence-

¹ *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 165.

² Pat. Roll. 1 Edw. III., II, m. 28; *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 170.

³ *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 174, where the royal letter is given in full.

⁴ *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 170-175. Both the seal of the convent and the seals of individual burgesses were attached to this document. St. Albans did not yet possess a corporate seal.

forth to be held and made by presentment of twelve burgesses. The bailiff of the town was to make executions within the town, and if he failed to do this, the bailiff of the hundred was to replace him temporarily. Certain of the provisions safeguarded the rights of the abbot and convent. No hand-mills were to be allowed, and the burgesses had still to bring their corn to be ground at the abbot's mill. Such services as these were to remain unchanged, and the abbot and convent could seize any hand-mills set up against their authority.¹

The townsmen of St. Albans, as the result of their agitation in 1327, had undoubtedly won a victory and successfully asserted their liberties. Had they been content with this it would have been well for them, but their good fortune proved too much for them and by pushing matters to extremes they prepared a way for the resumption of the abbot's authority in the town. The story of the reaction in favor of the monastic corporation can be briefly told. The burgesses soon began to abuse their newly won liberty. First of all they forced the abbot to grant them rights of common in Barnet wood, and then they proceeded to destroy many trees and hedges there. They invaded the abbot's warren and his fish-ponds, at pleasure; and in spite of the indenture, they set up some eighty hand-mills in the town.² Fortunately for the rapidly dwindling prosperity of the monastery Hugh de Everisdene, the aged abbot, died in the autumn of 1327, and a new and more energetic ruler succeeded him. This was the sagacious Richard de Wallingford, and under his wise and politic rule the burgesses were destined to lose all their lately acquired liberties. De Wallingford was economical and he reformed the monastery within and without, removing to distant cells of the abbey all monks who were favorably disposed towards the townsmen, or in any way connected with the town.³

The reaction did not take place immediately, and the encroachments on the abbot's rights continued. The townsmen refused to hold the view of frankpledge before the abbot's seneschal, or to act as jurors and present amercements, or to choose wardens for the assize of ale, but only for that of bread. The abbot, therefore, ordained that the view of frankpledge should be rigidly held by his sub-seneschal and bailiffs, and on the day that it was held four constables were appointed on behalf of the abbot for the four wards of

¹ The full text of the indenture and agreement is given in the *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 166-170; the *Lords Journals (Eng. Parl. Papers)*, LVI. 1105; *Eng. Parl. Papers*, 1826, IX. 9-10; Clutterbuck, *History of Hertfordshire*, I. 22 ff.

² *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 175-176.

³ *Ibid.*, II. 202; *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, pp. 184, 191, 272, 364.

the town, and under each constable two capital pledges were to act. At the same time other regulations tending to consolidate the abbot's judicial power in the town were settled. He also showed his power by forcing several of the townsmen, who held from him by such service, to supply horses for his journey to the cell at Tynemouth.¹

The burgesses of St. Albans were, meanwhile, making the most of the liberties they had won. A common seal for the borough, of silver throughout, was procured. Representatives were sent to Parliament, and to pay their expenses, and to support their newly won liberties, heavy contributions had to be levied in the town. Such expense was cheerfully borne now that they were free from the abbot's control, however, and they were prepared to stoutly resist any claims to jurisdiction over them on the part of the ecclesiastics. On his part the abbot was secretly planning to reassert his authority, and after three years of quietness the opportunity came; the two parties were again in conflict, but this time the ecclesiastics emerged triumphant from the fray.

A disturbance, caused by the abbot's attempting to exert his spiritual authority over the townsmen, took place in the spring of 1331. Two lives were lost and the royal coroner took cognizance of the matter.² An inquisition was ordered at the request of the abbot, who preferred charges against the burgesses for the many wrongs he had suffered at their hands.³ The verdict was entirely in the abbot's favor and reviewed the whole cause of the trouble since 1326, showing how the townsmen had made a confederation against the abbot; how they had extorted money and lands from various persons friendly to the convent; and how they had committed many outrages and acts of violence.⁴ Sixty-nine of the chief burgesses being arrested, thirty of them were adjudged guilty and thrown into prison. From thence they were released, on promising to pay a fine to the abbot. Those burgesses who had set up hand-mills, contrary to the abbot's rights, were prosecuted,⁵ and altogether Abbot Richard made life unpleasant for his tenants. It was no wonder, therefore, that the burgesses became weary of the struggle, and resolved to submit and effect a reconciliation with the abbot on the best terms possible. These terms were hard ones for them to offer:—the indenture of liberties gained in 1327 was to be surrendered and destroyed; there were to be no more hand-mills set up in the town; a large sum of money was to be paid as an indem-

¹ *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 205–208.

² *Ibid.*, II. 216–219.

³ *Ibid.*, 221–222.

⁴ *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 229–233.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 233–236.

nity for expenses incurred by the abbot and convent; and, finally, the townsmen were to give surety for future good behavior, both on their own part and on the part of their successors.¹ The burgesses themselves drew up these conditions. The abbot did not immediately assent to them, and the consequence was that the next day the representatives of the townsmen came to him again and surrendered unconditionally.² Their submission was accepted by the abbot, and although they soon repented of their hasty act, he kept the upper hand, and the submission was made unanimous.³

After surrendering their liberties to the abbot, thirty of the chief men of the town went to the royal chancery and there on their own behalf, and on behalf of the rest of the townsmen, they delivered up the royal confirmation and grant of liberties that had been conceded to them in 1327, and prayed that it might be cancelled, and the enrolment of it in the chancery records be blotted out.⁴ Accordingly the keeper of the rolls destroyed the charter and cancelled the enrolment of it. The silver seal of the borough was also surrendered and destroyed—the fragments being handed over to the monks to go towards restoring a ruined shrine.⁵ All the hand-mills in the town were surrendered to the abbot, and he, in token of the restoration of good will, gave a feast to the chief men of the town.⁶

Thus ended one of the greatest and most prolonged of efforts towards gaining borough rights and privileges, that was ever made by any monastic town in England. Beginning in the year of tumult and rebellion, 1327, it had lasted for three years or more, and had finally ended, in 1332, in the total discomfiture of the popular party at St. Albans. After having gained almost everything they sought for, the burgesses found themselves, in the end, outmatched by their powerful opponents, and they were forced to resign their dearly bought liberties. The power of the abbot and the convent over the town was re-established more firmly than ever, and it was not until almost half a century later that the townsmen again ventured to rise in rebellion, in sympathy with the great agrarian revolt of 1381.

¹ *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 250–251.

² *Ibid.*, 251–254.

³ *Ibid.*, 254–255.

⁴ Close Roll, 6 Edw. III., m. 26d.

⁵ *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 260; Madox, *Firma Burgi*, p. 140. Madox, though he gives an account of the surrender of the charter, totally misunderstood the motive of such action, as he thinks the burgesses were seeking to free themselves from the abbot's control.

⁶ *Gesta Abbatum*, II. 260–261.

Turning now to the history of another great municipal uprising which took place in the year 1327, we find at Bury St. Edmunds, in Suffolk, that almost similar occurrences to those at St. Albans took place. During the half-century preceding this revolt there had been three violent but unsuccessful attempts on the part of the burgesses to win self-government, and to control the jurisdiction in the town.¹ Now once again in the beginning of the year 1327 a fresh, and even more serious, revolt took place. As at St. Albans agents sent from London encouraged the townsmen to revolt. A small number of malcontents assembled themselves together in a tavern in Bury St. Edmunds, in January 1327, and from thence sent out a summons for the rioters to assemble. There were soon three thousand disaffected tenants and villains, gathered from all sides, and the abbey precincts were invaded and plundered. The convent officials, and several of the monks, were seized and imprisoned, and the rioters took away all the treasures of the abbey, the charters, muniments and papal bulls. Their chief desire was to destroy the bonds held against some of them by the abbot, which amounted in many cases to large sums. Having accomplished this work of destruction they proceeded to the gild-hall and there deposed their alderman, who had been elected under the abbot's control, and chose in his stead his more resolute brother, John de Berton. The new alderman was neither presented to the abbot and convent for confirmation, nor sworn in by the abbot's seneschal or steward. The gate-keepers of the town, who had been appointed by the abbot, were in like manner deposed and replaced by others chosen by the rioters.²

For several days the disturbances in the town went on increasing, and lawlessness prevailed everywhere. To overawe those who still held aloof from them, and especially the country people, the revolted townsmen erected a block, with an axe attached to it, and declared, precisely as those at St. Albans had done, that anyone refusing to join with them was to be there decapitated.³

The abbot, who had been absent attending Parliament, hastened back to the town to do what he could to quell the disturbance. Hearing of his return, the rebellious townsmen came to him and demanded that he should sign a charter of liberties they had drawn up. They would take no refusal and, finally, the abbot was forced to give in, and the charter was signed. By it the burgesses

¹ *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. Arnold, R. S., Vol. II., Introd., pp. xli-xliv.

² *Memorials*, II. 329, III. 38-40.

³ *Ibid.*, II. 329, III. 38-39.

obtained the right to a community, a common seal, a gild merchant, and an alderman who was henceforth to be elected independently of the abbot.¹

The charter in its entirety is an interesting and valuable record of those rights for which so many English towns under monastic control strove for so long and valiantly in the Middle Ages. In its thirty-five articles we can see the grievances of the burgesses redressed as they wished to have them redressed. Besides the great community privileges, already mentioned, the burgesses of Bury St. Edmunds were to control their own taxation, to have the custody of minors and orphans in the town, and the appointment of the gatekeepers. The markets were always to be held in the same place as formerly, offensive amercements were to be done away with and freedom of trade was to exist in the town. Various regulations as to the sale and inheritance of land are to be found in this charter, and some of its clauses protected the burgesses from several objectionable forms of legal procedure, such as trial by battle, which was always a *bête noire* to the medieval townsmen. Another curious and, in England at least, unique clause was that which provided the burgesses with a sanctuary post, in the market-place of the town, whither all evil-doers could flee for safety and protection.²

In this borough charter of Bury St. Edmunds one point comes out clearly, and that is that there was to be a close connection, if not absolute identity, between the community of burgesses and the gild merchant of the town. Further it was provided by this charter that all the franchises and customs enjoyed by the burgesses in the former time were to be continued to them forever. The abbot and convent were obliged in addition to sign a release from all actions and transgressions committed by the townsmen, and to enter into bonds, to the amount of five thousand pounds, to be paid if the charter was not speedily confirmed by the King. Such terms as these seemed preposterous to the abbot, who returned to London, nominally to urge the King to ratify the charter, in reality to lay his wrongs before the newly summoned Parliament.³

The nobles and prelates assembled at Westminster advised the abbot to regard the terms of the charter as invalid and void, and not to have it either enrolled or confirmed.⁴ Several of the townsmen had followed the abbot to London, thinking that he would perfect the

¹ *Memorials*, III. App. H.

² For this charter see App. H. of the *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, Vol. III., where it is given with a translation from the original Anglo-Norman.

³ *Memorials*, III. 333. The Parliament 1 Edw. III. was summoned to meet at Westminster, January 7, 1327.

⁴ *Memorials*, III. 333.

agreement there, but learning of his resolve to stand by his rights as lord of the town, they returned in all haste to Bury enraged at what they considered his treachery. Fresh scenes of violence were enacted in the town, and allured by promises of freedom and plunder the whole countryside joined the rioters, so that a multitude of twenty thousand were assembled in and around the town. They pillaged the abbey's stores and made free with the carts, provisions and everything else belonging to the monks. All the lower elements of the population, men ever hostile to the great ecclesiastical corporation, were aroused. Parish priests and friars, hating the regular clergy, joined and headed processions of rioters, and when the abbot sent an envoy to Rome, for protection against such attacks, they, also, sent two of their number. The abbot's messenger died on the way; those sent by the other party probably never visited Rome, but returned with clumsily forged bulls, purporting to be from the Pope, favoring the claims of the townspeople. So palpable, however, were these forgeries that the two clerks who bore them were held up to scorn and derision by their comrades.¹

In the midst of these tumults a special mandate from the King bade both parties, under penalty of forfeiture of all they could forfeit, not to assemble armed men and to cease from attacking each other. Instead each side was to send two deputies to the King at York, to treat of a settlement of the disputes betwixt the abbey and the town.² This mandate was issued May 14, 1327, and the day fixed for the meeting was the second week in June. To the royal commands no attention was paid, it seems, by the townsmen, for ten days later the King took the abbey into his protection, and appointed two custodians, with power to arrest and imprison all offenders. No officers of the abbey were, however, to be removed so long as they were obedient and submissive.³ Two additional custodians were appointed two months later, in July, and during the summer attempts at reconciliation and mediation were made.⁴ Proctors sent by the monks and by the townsmen appeared before the king and through them any further breach of the peace was prohibited. When, however, the King was called to the Scottish border with his army, in the autumn of 1327, the townsmen of Bury St. Edmunds, in spite of the royal commands and protection granted to the abbot, broke out in fresh revolt.⁵ They were summoned together by the

¹ *Memorials*, II. 333-340; *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, 213-214.

² *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, 151.

³ *Ibid.*, 106, 156.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 213-214.

⁵ *Memorials*, II. 337-338; *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, 214.

ringing of bells, and soon a vast multitude of people, of whom many were outsiders, were gathered together. The townsmen organized a confederation and swore to resist the abbot to the end. Then the conventual buildings were attacked, and either burned or in great part destroyed. The monks, driven desperate by these outrages, armed their servants and retainers and stoutly defended the remaining buildings. Under guise of treating of peace, however, the rioters captured twenty-four of the monks. These they cast into prison and menaced with death. Meanwhile equally riotous proceedings took place in twenty-two of the manors belonging to the convent. Property belonging to the monks was everywhere destroyed and encroached on. No attention whatever was paid to a second mandate from the King commanding a cessation of hostilities. The losses which the abbot and convent suffered at this time were enormous and beyond computation.¹

But assistance was at hand. The abbot had at last succeeded in securing a royal precept to the sheriff of Norfolk to quell the insurrection.² Thirty cart-loads of those arrested for their connection with the troubles were sent to Norwich to be tried, and four royal justices sat on the bench there. Several of the ringleaders expiated their misdoings on the gallows and many others were outlawed. The townsmen as a body were mulcted for damages in the sum of £140,000, an almost incredible amount for that time, and their representatives had to appear before the royal council and disclaim for themselves and their heirs any right to a *communitas*.³

The troubles were not yet ended, however. The outlawed members of the community bore a grudge against the abbot, Thomas de Draughton, whom they held to have perjured himself. These desperate men seized the abbot in his manor-house; conveyed him secretly to London, where he was left for some little time, and then had him taken over to Brabant, where he was left in confinement for many months. It was discovered that he had been abducted and the perpetrators were solemnly excommunicated by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Finally, in 1329, the poor abbot was discovered and brought back after his long captivity.⁴

No less than eleven different commissions and writs were issued in connection with the troubles at Bury St. Edmunds,⁵ and it was

¹ *Memorials*, II. 337-394; *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, 213-214.

² *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, 213-214.

³ *Memorials*, II. App. A; III. 46-47. The *Cronica Buriensis* gives the damages awarded as being only £40,000, but this seems to be an error.

⁴ *Memorials*, II. 349-353. His abductors were certain of the townsmen, under the popular mayor, John de Berton, who had managed to break gaol.

⁵ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, pp. 193, 217-219, 411, 425.

not until five years after the first outbreak that everything was peaceably settled. By the *concordia*, or peace agreement, of the year 1331, a settlement was arrived at. The abbot, on promise by the townsmen of future good conduct and submission to his authority, by successive remissions excused the townsmen from all but a small part of the fine and damages. The extorted charter and other such grants were declared null and void. The townsmen again resigned all claim to a *communitas*. The treasures, documents and bonds taken from the abbey were largely restored to its possession and everything quieted down.¹

The burgesses of Bury St. Edmunds, like those of St. Albans, had failed completely to win for themselves either greater liberty or the right of self-government. A terrible lesson of obedience to their ecclesiastical lords had been taught them. The borough was still under the control of the abbot and was destined to remain so down to the time of the dissolution of monasteries. There were no further revolts that we know of, at Bury St. Edmunds, until the great rising of 1381.

The risings at St. Albans and Bury St. Edmunds have long been known to students of English history. They have, however, been regarded rather as isolated instances of local disaffection than as examples of a widespread movement of monastic towns towards emancipation from ecclesiastical control. A number of cases of other risings lead to the view that the movement was a somewhat general one at this particular time. Most noteworthy amongst these additional risings is that of the burgesses of Abingdon, a town in Berkshire, not far from Oxford, which, likewise, occurred in the early part of the year 1327.²

Abingdon from the earliest times had belonged to the monks, and the control of the abbot was absolute. He had even been able to assert his privileges against royalty, and until the year 1327 there seems to have been little or no trouble with the townsmen. In the spring of that year, however, a very serious outbreak against the abbot's control took place. The male population of Abingdon township met together at the tolling of the bell of St. Helen's church. They gathered in the church porch and churchyard and took counsel together concerning their grievances against the abbot, especially in the matter of the market and market stalls, the absolute right to which was claimed by the monks. The discontented

¹ *Memoria's*, III. 41-46.

² The account given of the troubles at Abingdon is based, mainly, upon that in Wood's *Historia et Antiquales Universitatis Oxoniensis*, Oxford, 1792-1796, pp. 161-163, though additional material has been gathered from MSS. in the British Museum and Public Record Office.

townsmen resolved to take violent measures and to incite a rebellion in the town. The meeting dispersed with threats of violence towards the abbey and its inmates, but the monks had some friends in the town who warned them to be on their guard.¹

This first meeting seems to have been held on a Monday, about the middle of May, and another meeting was called for the Wednesday night following. The people again assembled at the church of St. Helen, the parish church of Abingdon, when the bell tolled the hour of midnight. It was a midnight meeting of conspirators to organize an attack on the abbey, rather than a public meeting of burgesses. Captains were appointed and armed bands organized. At daybreak the rioting began with an attack on the new gild or market hall, recently erected by the abbey authorities because, as the chronicler remarks, "the town and market were theirs." The new hall was set on fire and totally destroyed. The next place to be attacked was the little church of St. Nicholas, which lay close to the abbey's great gate. The church was set on fire, but the fire was extinguished and the rioters were dispersed from in front of the gates by armed men, engaged by the abbey for its defence, who sallied out. Two of the townsmen were slain and several others captured and thrown into prison, there to await trial before the royal justices, as malefactors. The courage of the attacking party was somewhat dampened and the monks given a breathing space. Of this they took advantage to issue a proclamation, in the king's name, offering pardon to such of the rioters as would submit and surrender. Many took advantage of this offer and were taken into custody by the monks. The mild and easy-tempered abbot, John de Canynge, who had just returned from his country residence, smoothed matters down and freed those who had been captured in the conflict.²

Many of the townsmen, however, wished for revenge on the monks for the death of their comrades, and, not feeling strong enough by themselves, they sent messengers to Oxford, five miles away, to call the townsmen there to aid them. No English town in the Middle Ages had a more riotous or unruly populace than Oxford. There had been frequent conflicts betwixt town and gown; now both were given an opportunity to unite against a powerful monastic corporation, owning large property near the city, and against which they no doubt had a common feeling of hostility. The invitation of the Abingdon malcontents was readily accepted

¹ Wood's *Historia*, p. 162; Brit. Mus. MS. 28666, p. 155; Egerton Collection (B. M.), 282, p. 20.

² Brit. Mus. MSS., 28666, p. 156; Egerton MSS., 282, p. 20.

and a vast multitude from Oxford, headed by their mayor and prominent burgesses and accompanied by many of the more turbulent scholars, marched to Abingdon. On the way thither they destroyed the manor of Northcote, belonging to the abbey, and having entered Abingdon laid siege to the conventual buildings.¹ One of the great abbey gates was set on fire, in spite of the valiant defence of those within, who rained showers of stones and arrows on the attackers. Meanwhile others of the invading force had laid siege to the hospital of St. John, but met with so stout a resistance that an entrance could not be effected. Finally, however, a way was forced through the church of St. Nicholas and the rioters entered the abbey precincts. The gaol was immediately broken open and all the prisoners set free. Then the outer and inner gates of the monastery were set on fire and free ingress given to the rabble to plunder and pillage the monastic buildings. The terrified monks took sanctuary in the chapel, but this proved unavailing for Edmund de la Becke, leader of the attack, boldly invaded the sacred precincts with his followers, wounded one of the older monks and dragged the others away and thrust them into prison. Other unfortunate brethren fled with their abbot across the river and several of these were drowned in their hurried efforts to escape their pursuers. The abbey buildings were robbed of everything of value that they contained. Vestments, books, jewels and all such movables were taken away and much damage was wantonly done to the buildings. The treasury was emptied, and deeds and charters burnt and destroyed. Even the horses and cattle belonging to the monks were driven away.²

The day following the rioters held a meeting in Bagley Wood, between Abingdon and Oxford, at which three thousand were present. Messengers were dispatched to the prior and such monks as still remained in the convent. In fear and trembling the ecclesiastics came before the threatening assembly, which demanded certain concessions from them as representing the abbot and convent. The men of Abingdon were to have a provost and bailiffs of their own, who should be annually elected and have custody of the town. The abbot and convent were to abandon all rights they might claim to possess in Abingdon by royal charter, and they were to forego any action for damages, injuries and obligations that might ensue from the attack on the abbey by the rioters. These, with other less

¹ Egerton MS. 282, p. 21, which says: "Afterwards entering the town, they made such horrid noises that the unusualness of it even frightened those who had invited them thither."

² Brit. Mus. MS. 28666, p. 156; Egerton 282, p. 20; *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, p. 288.

important demands, were incorporated in a charter and the prior and brethren were threatened with death to themselves, and the total destruction of the monastery, unless they assented in the name of the convent to this document. Under the circumstances little choice was left to them save compliance and the day following they took a solemn oath before a notary, to observe the articles of the charter. The abbey seal, which had been seized by the leaders of the rabble, was produced and the prior was forced to seal the charter with it. In addition bonds were exacted to the amount of £3000 that no one would be molested, vexed, or called in question for being concerned in these proceedings against the monastery.¹

Meanwhile tumult and disorder reigned in the town of Abingdon. The market rights of the abbot were freely encroached on; his portmoot court was interfered with, so that it could not be held; and his bailiffs, servants and officials of the abbey were attacked and beaten by the townsmen.² The troubles continued for over a fortnight, until, at the instance of the prior, the Bishop of St. David's visited the place and sought to restore peace and order.³ The abbot himself, who had fled on the occasion of the attack, made a successful appeal for royal protection. A commission consisting of four royal justices was directed to hear and determine the complaints and charges of the abbot against the men of Abingdon and Oxford.⁴ A writ was also issued to the sheriff of Oxford and Berks to cause proclamation to be made, prohibiting any one under pain of forfeiture, from invading by armed force the abbey of Abingdon, of the King's patronage, or any of its manors, or from attempting anything to the breach of the King's peace, or from inflicting damage or annoyance upon the abbot and monks in their persons or goods. Anyone doing any of these things was to be arrested, and if necessary the sheriff was to levy the *posse comitatus* to quell the revolt, and all malefactors taken were to be kept in prison until further notice. Finally, the King was to be notified concerning the proceedings, for he had learnt that the abbey was wasted and impoverished by the incursions of evil-doers and disturbers of the peace, and many of the monks driven away. Accordingly the abbey was to be under royal protection, together with its inmates, their lands and persons, and the sheriff was to exercise protection over them. A similar mandate was directed to the *conservatores pacis*,

¹ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, pp. 22-23; Brit. Mus. MS. 28666, p. 156; Egerton MS. 281, p. 21.

² *Cal. Pat. Rolls.*, 1327-1330, pp. 288-289.

³ Brit. Mus. MS. 28666, p. 159.

⁴ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, May 24, 1327.

or guardians of the peace, in the county of Berks, and these measures proved efficacious in subduing the revolt.¹

The next Sunday Abbot John de Canynge returned to his monastery with a bodyguard of gentlemen and archers. Many of the chief rioters fled from the town, others concealed themselves from justice; several of the latter were captured, however, and confined in Wallingford Castle. Later on they were tried before the royal justices and twelve of them were hanged. An even larger number would have suffered capital punishment had it not been for the mediation of the abbot, who interceded successfully on behalf of sixty of the culprits.² The losses which the abbey had sustained were very large, being estimated at over ten thousand pounds. So heavily crippled, indeed, was the great monastic corporation that in January 1328 the King, at the abbot's request, appointed two custodians to guard its revenues and interests.³ Certain of the stolen valuables, along with deeds and charters were recovered by the abbot, but much of irreparable value was completely lost.

The processes and commissions in connection with the troubles at Abingdon in 1327 are very numerous. They extend into the year 1330 and include indictments against the men of Oxford as well as those of Abingdon.⁴ Large numbers of the former were successively apprehended and tried, with the result that in many cases they were hanged for the part they had taken. Hundreds of offenders were condemned to death, fine, or imprisonment during the three years that followed the rising, and in the case of some of the chief offenders the proceedings dragged on several years longer on account of sentences of outlawry.⁵ The townsmen had to surrender their charter of liberties and privileges, extorted from the prior and monks, and go back to their former state of dependence on the abbot and convent, and also make good the losses sustained by the abbey. To this end they were prosecuted by Abbot Robert de Garford, who succeeded John de Canynge in December, 1328, and was a man of much sterner temper and disposition, and of greater decision and force than his predecessor had been.⁶ This

¹ For these writs see: *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, p. 125; *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1327-1330, pp. 201, 203.

² Brit. Mus. MS. 28666, p. 160; *Placita Coram Rege*, 1 Edw. III., Hilary term, roll 271, m. lviii. (Record Office).

³ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, p. 202; there is also a curious petition of the abbot and convent to the king, asking for the patronage of a church on account of their losses, in *Ancient Petitions* (Record Office), file 30, No. 1467.

⁴ Dugdale, *Monasticon*, I. 509; *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, gives abstracts of these commissions.

⁵ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, pp. 458, 475.

⁶ Brit. Mus. MS. 28666, pp. 163 and 164.

abbot regained complete ascendancy over the town. The monastery, the hospital of St. John, the church of St. Nicholas and all other vulnerable points were fortified by royal license,¹ and, though conflicts occurred later between abbey and town, Abingdon remained, down to reformation times, a monastic town under the absolute control of abbot and convent.

The risings at St. Albans, Bury St. Edmunds, and Abingdon were the three great outbreaks of which we have detailed accounts. Other risings, however, occurred throughout England of which we have merely a passing mention but which, perhaps, were serious at the time. For example there is a royal letter to the sheriff of Bedford to take and put in prison certain armed men and malefactors who lie in wait for the prior of Dunstable. A century earlier Dunstable had been the scene of a serious conflict betwixt the monks and the townsmen, and no doubt the abbot's tenants took the opportunity in 1327 to again make trouble.² At Faversham, in Kent, and at Winchelsea, in Sussex, there are said to have been similar outbreaks on the part of the populace against ecclesiastical control and jurisdiction.³ The similarity of these movements, all occurring in the year 1327, seems to indicate clearly that there existed a wide-spread desire on the part of the burgesses, living under monastic control, to throw off the jurisdiction of their ecclesiastical lords at this particular time. No definite alliance, no inter-communal league, was formed between them. It was simply that the time was favorable for insurrection, and that the townsmen in many of these places were ready and eager to revolt at the first opportunity. Accordingly the year 1327 is remarkable in the annals of English municipal history for the number of risings that took place in the monastic towns. That these risings were without exception unsuccessful, has, I trust, been clearly shown. The punishment meted out to the rebellious burgesses was always severe; so severe, indeed, that no further troubles of importance are known to have occurred in monastic towns until the great revolt of 1381.

In some respects the outbreaks which occurred in England, in 1327, are similar to the risings against the control of ecclesiastical lords that took place in the communes of Northern France, and in the German episcopal cities, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

¹ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, p. 547.

² *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1327-1330, pp. 232-233; for the earlier conflict see *Annales Monastici*, R. S., III. 105-124, or the article on the history of the conflict in the *Cornhill Magazine*, VI. 835 ff.

³ *Brit. Mus. MS.* 28666, p. 164.

But the English monastic towns did not hold the important place in the national life of England held by the large and populous *Bischofsstädte* of the Continent. For while there the ecclesiastical towns led the others, in the struggle for liberty, the same class of towns in England were backward in obtaining privileges and immunities, being far outstripped in this, as in all other respects, by the royal boroughs. It was not until the second half of the thirteenth century that any general movement towards an assertion of their liberties is observable in the English monastic towns. The year 1327 marked the culmination of a period of secret discontent and conspiracy on the part of the townsmen under monastic control.

It is, however, by comparing the struggle in England with that of an earlier date on the Continent that we can best understand how it was that the struggle in the English monastic towns proved so fruitless. The Continental towns were, as has been remarked, much larger and of relatively greater importance than those of the same nature in England, and, consequently, the populace were superior in number, organization and influence. A long tradition of continuous municipal development and civic stability enabled them to offer a solidier opposition to their over-lord and to exert a greater influence on the politics of the day. Then too, the struggle on the Continent was generally one between the bishop by himself against the mass of townsmen by themselves. Royalty did not interfere, save in exceptional instances, and in fact rather favored the development of the municipal power as weakening and undermining the feudal. Then in France and Germany the townsmen had everything in their favor, and several other political factors of importance in the eleventh and twelfth centuries aided the efforts of the communes towards liberty and rendered their struggle a successful one. But in England all was different, and whenever the townsmen under the control of an abbot or prior made any efforts to win liberties and self-government the chances were all against the success of the movement. The ecclesiastical lords held their towns either by prescription or by royal charter, frequently by both, and no English king was inclined, unless his personal interests were involved, to deprive powerful religious bodies of rights long possessed and enjoyed by them, or granted to them by his predecessors. The royal power in fact was, as we have seen, exercised on the side of ecclesiastical domination and it formed the most effective support for the monks. Even if the townsmen made good their stand for a short time, as at St. Albans, their lord was almost certain to triumph in the end and reassert his rights over them. England was rarely, even during the Middle Ages, in such a state that

insurrection and violence could go long unpunished. The central authority was always powerful enough to interfere in the affairs of the towns and a resort to force on the part of the townsmen was sure to be severely punished. The strong alliance between Church and State which existed throughout the middle period made it certain in England that if ecclesiastical lords would not grant liberties to their burgesses peaceably, and few were inclined to do so, there was little hope of winning such liberties by force and violence.

Thus it was that the struggle, which took place in so many monastic towns, in 1327, ended so disastrously for the townsmen. They gained nothing in the way of greater liberty and self-government, nay, rather they lost something, in that the control of the abbot and convent over them was strengthened and they sank back in the scale of municipal development. What little result these risings may have had was to teach the ecclesiastical corporations the danger and folly of driving the townsmen too far and of keeping too strict a hand over them. As an interesting phase of English municipal history the risings in the monastic towns in 1327 are worthy of note, for they show the strength and influence of the monastic system in England, and how in many a town the monastic corporation was able to beat down and suppress the growing municipal spirit of the time, though we cannot but agree with the unknown versifier who wrote :

“ Saint Benet made never none of them
To have lordship of man nor town.”

NORMAN MACLAREN TRENHOLME.

THE FRENCH HAKLUYT; MARC LESCARBOT OF VERVINS

THE rôle played by France in American discovery and colonization during the course of the sixteenth century was by no means such a minor and unimportant one as is generally supposed. Apart from the fact that her privateers long preceded the English of Elizabeth's day in their attacks on Spanish commerce—even Columbus dreaded a brush with these French rovers—vessels under the command of such men as de Gonneville, Verrazano, the Parmentiers, Jacques Cartier, Jean Alfonse, Villegagnon, Ribaut, Laudonnière and the Marquis de la Roche made the *fleur-de-lis* known and respected along the whole Atlantic coast from Labrador as far south as Brazil. True it is, that Frenchmen did not go much further afield in these parts. No French vessel entered the Pacific through the straits of Magellan nor is there any record of an attempt on the part of a Frenchman to solve the mystery of a North-west Passage. The colonies sent out at this time to America by France also proved unsuccessful; but so did those which came from England. Indeed at the close of the century, France was the only power outside Spain and Portugal which had a foothold in America.¹

Comparing the whole careers of France and England in America in the sixteenth century that of France was indeed the more brilliant during the first half of that century. Then took place the voyages of de Gonneville and Denis to Brazil, those of the Parmentiers to the same region as well as to Cape Breton and Newfoundland, that of Verrazano along the whole coast from South Carolina northward as far as Cape Breton; while the exploration of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the discovery of the river of that name by Jacques Cartier during the years 1534 to 1536 added fresh and ever-green laurels to the French name. Unfortunately the attempts made by Cartier and Roberval in 1541 and 1542 to find the mysterious kingdom of Saguenay, said to be rich in gold and precious stones, met with no success—for the simple reason that no such country existed.

¹ This was represented by the poor wretches left by de la Roche on Sable Island and who were not taken off till 1603. Cf. Gosselin, *Nouvelles Glânes Historiques Normandes*, Rouen, 1873, pp. 10 *et seq.*

During the same period, French privateers were continually engaged in preying upon the Spanish colonies and Spanish shipping. So early as 1498 indeed Columbus had been obliged to divert the course of his third voyage in order to avoid a French fleet;¹ and in the year 1513 two caravels were sent out to guard the coasts of Cuba.² Ten years later the rich fleet from Mexico was waylaid near Cape St. Vincent by six French rovers who carried off two caravels loaded with gold.³ In the year 1528 a French corsair burned the town of San German in Porto Rico,⁴ while during the years 1536 and 1537 a perfect reign of terror existed among the islands on account of the ravages of a fleet of these buccaneers.⁵ Early in the year 1538, Havana was burned and destroyed.⁶ During the war with Spain from 1542 to 1544 these islands proved a happy hunting-ground for many a French rover and so pleased were they as a rule with the success of their visits that they continued to return, even after peace had been declared.⁷

The list of English voyages and discoveries during the first half of the sixteenth century is on the other hand a very meagre one. About the year 1507 Sebastian Cabot seems to have made an attempt to find a northwest passage⁸ and twenty years later an English vessel, which had lost her consort in a storm near Newfoundland, made her way along the coast southward as far as the island of Porto Rico.⁹ Beyond an unimportant expedition to Newfoundland in 1536, there¹⁰ is nothing further to record except a few trading voyages to Brazil.¹¹ The only English privateer, of which we have any notice at this time, is one that visited the West Indies in the year 1540 under a French pilot.¹²

¹ F. Navarrete, *Colección de los Viajes y Descubrimientos*, etc., Madrid, 1825, I. 245; "y navegué á la Isla de la Madera por camino no acostumbrado, por evitar escándalo que pudiera tener con un armada de Francia."

² *Colección de Documentos Inéditos de Indias*, second series, VI. 3, No. 281 and note.

³ Archivo General de Indias at Seville, est. 2, cajon 5, leg. $\frac{1}{2}$, fols. 1-2. An English translation of this document will be found in Murphy, *The Voyage of Verrazzano*, New York, 1875, Appendix No. IV., pp. 164-165.

⁴ *Colección de Documentos Inéditos de Indias*, first series, XL. 564.

⁵ *Ibid.*, second series, IV. 425-426; VI. 22-31.

⁶ *Ibid.*, second series, VI. 34-35, 73.

⁷ *Ibid.*, second series, IV. 197, Nos. 407-408 and pp. 199 and 240; VI. 256, 297-298 and 302. Archivo General de Indias, Seville, est. 2, caj. 5, leg. $\frac{1}{2}$, fols. 14-15, and 17-23.

⁸ *The Geographical Journal*, London, February 1899, pp. 204-209.

⁹ Hakluyt, *Principall Navigations*, London, 1600, III. 129. Purchas, *His Pilgrimes*, London, 1625, III. 809. *Colec. de Doc. Inéd.*, first series, XXXVII. 456-458; XL. 305-354, and second series, IV. 57-60.

¹⁰ Hakluyt, *op. cit.*, pp. 129-131.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 700-701.

¹² *Col. de Doc. Inéd.*, first series, I. 572 and 575.

In the second half of the century, however, matters were completely altered. France, weakened by constant religious and civil wars, had no force to waste in foreign adventure ; on the other hand England, blessed, especially during Elizabeth's reign, with domestic peace and growing prosperity, seemed to awaken to new life ; and expeditions were despatched in unremitting succession to almost all the four corners of the globe. At the close of the century not only could a writer say that " many valiant attempts had been made in searching al-most all the corners of the vaste and new world of America," but two separate expeditions had also gone around the world in the short interval of eleven years. The exploits, however, of Drake and Cavendish in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, of Frobisher and Davis in the northern seas, of Raleigh and Gilbert in Virginia and Newfoundland, of the Hawkinses in the Spanish Main, of Oxenham, Barker, Fenton and the Earl of Cumberland against Spanish commerce in general, are too well known to need recital here.

Opposed to the wonderful exploits of these men, such achievements as those of Villegagnon in Brazil, of Ribaut, Laudonnière and Gourgues in Florida, of Strozzi and de Chaste in the Azores and of de la Roche and Chefdostel at Sable Island, seem extremely moderate ones. Fortunately they do not represent all that was done by Frenchmen in America at this time. It is to be sure a most strange fact that no French writer yet discovered has anything to say of the exploits of his countrymen at this time in the West Indies. When one considers how great a portion of Hakluyt's collection is filled with minute accounts of the doings of the English rovers then famous, one recognizes what the loss of these French narratives means to the fame of the French seamen of that day. The French, however, might reply that like the Spartans of old they were too busy performing brave deeds, to find the time to describe them ; for in Spanish sources we now and again get glimpses of their doings. Thus in July 1553 the town of Santiago was taken and only given up when a large ransom had been paid.¹ In the following year, in which eight different French vessels touched at Porto Rico alone,² these rovers so lorded it over this whole region that the governors thereof complained to the Emperor Charles the Fifth that the French were as complete masters of those seas, as the Emperor himself of the River Guadalquivir in Spain.³ In the year 1555 Havana was destroyed for the second time in seventeen years ;

¹ *Colec. de Doc. Inéd. de Ind.*, second series, VI. 360, Nos. 492 and 494, p. 428, and pp. 434-443.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 427-428.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 360, No. 492.

and in the same year three other towns met with a similar fate.¹ The riches collected were no doubt great, for the poor colonists complained that the French now seemed to look upon those islands as all their own.²

It is notices of this sort which make us deplore the absence of such full accounts of these expeditions as Hakluyt has preserved for us of the doings of Hawkins and Drake. Had there then existed in France some one willing to make a journey, not of two hundred miles, but even of ten, "onely to learne the whole trueth from the onely man then alive that was in this (or that) discoverie,"³ France's record before the tribunal of history for achievements in America during the latter half of the sixteenth century would be far more brilliant than it is. The accounts even of such voyages as those of Cartier and Roberval to the St. Lawrence in 1541 and 1542 are known to us only through Hakluyt, for the single Frenchman who shortly afterwards did try to make a collection of early French voyages to America could then find absolutely nothing about them in that language.

This man, who represents in France the position occupied by Hakluyt in the history of English geography, was Marc Lescarbot of Vervins. It was however only chance which took Lescarbot to America and only the inducement of his friends caused him to write about his voyage. When engaged in this, it occurred to him that "since loose papers are soon lost," it would be well "to add in a brief form to the account of the voyage of de Monts and de Poutrincourt, that which had been written about the earlier French discoveries."⁴ Instead however of interviewing the living survivors of such expeditions as that to Florida or to Sable Island, he contented himself with merely reading at the King's Library anything he found in print on those subjects. He seems to have once met a connection of Roberval's but the oral information vouchsafed by this namesake of the first viceroy of Canada is of little or no importance.⁵ Although on the other hand he has the advantage

¹ *Colec. de Doc. Inéd. de Ind.*, first series, XII. 49-82; second series, VI. 360-427 and p. 436.

² *Ibid.*, second series, VI. 437, "Que tienen los franceses por tan propinquas y por suyas estas yslas y Tierra Firme mas que a Francia," etc.

³ Hakluyt, *op. cit.*, III. 131, "As hee [Thomas Butts] told me Richard Hakluyt of Oxford himselfe, to whom I rode 200 miles onely to learne the whole trueth of this voyage [to Newfoundland] from his own mouth, as being the onely man now alive that was in this discoverie."

⁴ M. Lescarbot, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, Paris, 1866, I. 4-5, "Et d'autant que tant de Memoires dispersés se perdent facilement. . . . Ainsi m'a semblé à propos de joindre brièvement, et comme par epitome à la description des derniers voyages faits par les Sieurs de Monts et de Poutrincourt . . . ce que noz François ont laissé par écrit des découvertes qu'ils ont dès long temps fait es parties Occidentales," etc.

⁵ *Ibid.*, edition of 1609, p. 433.

over Hakluyt of having visited America and of having left us a most entertaining account of the manners and customs of the Indians near the Bay of Fundy, yet he would have merited a still larger share of our gratitude had he given us, as his English contemporary has done, long, original and interesting accounts of the voyages made to America before and during his own time.

Marc Lescarbot was born at Vervins near Laon of a good family sometime between the years 1560 and 1570.¹ The exact date of his birth is not known. After receiving a good education, he took up the study of law, but he had not yet been called to the bar when in 1598 he pronounced in his native town before the papal legate an oration of thanksgiving on the conclusion of peace with Spain.² In the following year he published a translation of a Latin work by Cardinal Baronius on the origin of the Russians.³ From the title-page of this we see that he was called to the bar in that year. Among his first briefs seem to have been several in which Jean de Biencourt Seigneur de Poutrincourt was interested.

The family of Biencourt was descended from a certain André de Biencourt who was prior of Biencourt in 1142. Many of its members had held offices of importance in Picardy, and Florimond de Biencourt, the father of Lescarbot's friend, had been a gentleman of the household of Francis I. Under Henry II. he held the office of governor of the duchy of Aumale and in 1549 was sent as ambassador to the Emperor Charles V. to marry Anne, daughter of Hercules of Este, by procuration for the son of the Duke of Guise. By his wife Jeanne de Salazar Florimond had nine children, four boys and five girls. The eldest boy, a page to Henry II., was never heard of after the battle of Dreux, and Charles, the third son, was killed at the battle of Moncontour in 1569. Jacques the second son inherited the title, while Jean the fourth son became famous as the colonizer of New France.⁴ Jean, who had received in 1565 the seigneurie of Marsilly-sur-Seine, served as squire to the Duke d'Aumale. He also enjoyed the confidence of Henry IV., who ap-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 180, "Vervin en Tierache lieu de ma naissance," etc. Cf. Demarsy, *Notes sur Marc Lescarbot, Avocat Vervinois*, Vervins, 1868, *passim*.

² *Ibid.*, p. 801, "A Vervin, lieu de ma naissance où je fis. . . deux actions de grace en forme de Panegyrique à Monseigneur le Legat Alexandre de Medicis Cardinal de Florence depuis Pape Leon XI., imprimées à Paris." Copies of this oration in Latin and in French are preserved at the Bibliothèque Nationale, nos. L. b. 35, 732 and 733.

³ *Discours sur l'Origine des Russiens et de leur miraculeuse Conversion et de quelques actes mémorables de leurs Rois; en outre comme par laps de tems ils ont quitté la verité connue et maintenant une grande partie d'iceux se sont rangez à la communion du S. Siège Apostolic*, traduit en François du Latin du Cardinal Cesar Baronius par Marc Lescarbot Advocat, Paris, 1599.

⁴ De la Chenaye-Desbois et Badier, *Dictionnaire de la Noblesse*, Paris, 1864, III. 193 et seqq.

pointed him Chevalier of the King's order and *maitre de camp* of an infantry regiment.¹ In the year 1604 he set sail with de Monts in the hope of finding in New France a suitable spot to which he might retire with his family. His choice fell upon Port Royal in Acadia and this de Monts at once made over to him.²

During de Poutrincourt's absence Lescarbot was given charge of his affairs. These seem to have kept him busy until de Poutrincourt's return in the autumn of 1604 when "those," he says, "who had attacked him savagely during his absence at once became silent and gracious."³ During the year 1605 Lescarbot doubtless continued his practice at Paris, for it was from there that he set forth with de Poutrincourt in the spring of 1606 to embark at La Rochelle for New France. De Poutrincourt was going out, at some sacrifice to himself, to take charge of the colony in the absence of de Monts, while Lescarbot's excuse was his desire "to examine the land with his own eye and to flee a corrupt world." It appears that some disfavours received in court had given his mind for the moment a pessimistic turn.⁴

Embarking on the *Jonas* at La Rochelle in May they did not reach Port Royal till the end of July.⁵ On July 30, 1607, Lescarbot left Port Royal on his return to France so that he passed just twelve months in the country.⁶ He saw however very little of it except the region about Port Royal and the coast from there to Canso. The only other points visited were the river St. John and the island of Ste. Croix in the Bay of Fundy.⁷ Although he left

¹ *De la Chenaye-Desbois et Badier*, p. 203.

² Lescarbot, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, Paris, 1609, p. 473. "Le sieur de Poutrincourt estoit desirieux dès y avoit long temps de voir ces terres de la Nouvelle France et y choisir quelque lieu propre pour s'y retirer avec sa famille;" also p. 481, "Le sieur de Poutrincourt ayant trouvé ce lieu (Port Royal) à son gré, il le demanda avec les terres et continentes au sieur de Monts . . . ce qui luy fut octroyé." For proof of his name, cf. p. 572: "Tant à cause de la fête saint Jean, que pour l'amour du Sieur de Poutrincourt, qui porte le nom de ce Saint;" and the signature on p. 659.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 542. "Quoi qu'à son premier voyage il eust éprouvé la malice de certains qui le poursuivoient rigoureusement absent et devindrent souples et muets à son retour."

⁴ *Ibid.*, 542-543. "Et ayant eu l'honneur de le [Poutrincourt] conoitre quelques années auparavant, il me demanda si ie voulais estre de la partie. A quoy ie demanday un jour de terme pour luy répondre. Apres avoir bien consulté en moy-même, desirieux non tant de voir le pais . . . que de reconoitre la terre oculairement, à laquelle j'avoy ma volonté portée, et fuir un monde corrompu, je luy donnay parole; estant même induit par l'injustice que m'avoient peu auparavant fait certains Juges Presidiaux," etc.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 558. "Le Samedi . . . trezième de May, nous levames les ancrs et fines voiles," etc.; p. 581, "Le Jeudi vingt-septième de Juillet nous entrames dedans [Port Royal] avec le flot," etc.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 643. "Et le 30 de Juillet partirent les deux autres. J'estois dans la grande," etc.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 637. "Et pource que Chevalier desiroit amasser quelques Castores; il l'envoya dans une petite barque à la riviere Saint-Jean . . . et l'île Sainte-Croix

Port Royal for Canso at the end of July, the vessel in which the colonists returned to France (it was again the *Jonas*) did not leave Canso till her cargo of fish was complete, which was early in September.¹

On his return to France in the autumn of 1607, Lescarbot again resumed his practice at Paris, and it was not until the Easter law vacation of the year 1608 that his thoughts were turned to the production of a work on New France. At the instance of his friends, he was soon persuaded to set to work upon a history of French efforts to establish a foothold in the New World. His plan was, after briefly reviewing the early voyages of Verrazano, Cartier, Villegagnon and Laudonnière from books found in the King's Library, to give an original account of the attempt at colonization recently made by de Monts, and in which he himself had taken part.² The work, which was finished at the end of November,³ was published in the following year under the title of *Histoire de la Nouvelle France contenant les navigations, découvertes, et habitations faites par les François ès Indes Occidentales et Nouvelle France sous l'aveu et autorité de nos Rois Tres-Christiens et les diverses fortunes d'iceux en l'exécution de ces choses depuis cent ans jusques à hui*.

The work is divided into three books. In the first are described the voyages of Verrazano, Villegagnon, Ribaut, Laudonnière and Gourgues. The accounts of the expeditions of Cartier, Roberval, de la Roche and de Monts occupy the second book, while in the

. . . Je fus du voyage," etc. Cf. also pp. 752 and 822. A letter dated at Port Royal August 22, 1606, and written in all probability by Lescarbot, is preserved in the Archives of the French Foreign Office (*Amérique*, I. 25 and 26). It was published by M. Gabriel Marcel in the *Revue de Géographie* for January 1885. In 1613 Champlain (*Œuvres* published by Laverdière, III. 123) mentioned that Lescarbot had never been beyond Ste. Croix and four years later Lescarbot replied (edition of 1617, p. 594) that he had never pretended the contrary.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 649. "Le troisième jour de Septembre nous levames les ancrs," etc. Cf. also p. 716.

² *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, Paris 1609, p. 5. "Ainsi m'a semblé à propos de joindre brièvement et comme par epitome à la description des derniers voyages faits par les sieurs de Monts et de Poutrincourt en la Nouvelle France, ce que nos François ont laissé par écrit des découvertes qu'ils ont dès long temps fait ès parties Occidentales," and again p. 6, "Je veux donc faire un recueil general de ce que j'ay leu en divers petits traitez et memoires que j'ay pris tant en la Bibliothèque du Roy qu'ailleurs; ensemble de ce que le sieur De Monts . . . a fait et exploité au voyage qu'il y fit il y a cinq ans; et finalement ce que j'y ay veu et remarqué, en l'espace de deux étés et un hiver que nous avons esté en ladite province . . . tant pour contenter l'honnête desir de plusieurs qui dès long temps requierent cela de moy, que pour employer utilement les heures que ie puis avoir de loisir durant ce temps qu'on appelle des Vacations." He added in 1617 "des Vacations en l'an 1608." Cf. also p. 663.

³ The privilege to print is dated November 27, 1608. Cf. also p. 526, "l'an dernier mil six cens sept;" and p. 624, "le dernier hiver de l'an mil six cens sept et huit;" also p. 652.

third and last he gives a description of the manners and customs of the savages of the New World.¹

After stating what he proposed to do in Chapter I. and proving to his satisfaction in Chapters II. and III. that the Gauls, being descended from Noah, had always been great navigators,² and that they or other Europeans were the ancestors of the American Indians, he begins his account of the French expeditions to the New World in Chapter IV. with that of Verrazano. He does not go into this very fully however but contents himself with merely copying the account given by Belleforest.³ He appears however to have seen Ramusio, for he gives the same account of Verrazano's death as that given by the latter.⁴

His account of the expeditions of Ribaut, Laudonnière and Gourgues which occupies Chapters V. to XX. is taken from a work published at Paris in the year 1586 under the title of *L'Histoire Notable de la Floride situee es Indes Occidentales contenant les trois voyages faits en icelle par certains Capitaines et Pilotes françois, décrits par le Capitaine Laudonnière, qui y a commandé l'espace d'un an trois mois; à laquelle a esté adjousté un quatriesme voyage fait par le Capitaine Gourgues*. This work had been published by the efforts of a French mathematician named Basanier and of the English collector of voyages Hakluyt.⁵ It is strange however that no one has hitherto pointed out that the "tomb" in which the manuscript had been lying was Thevet's, the Cordelier's, cell.⁶ Lescarbot, who

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 25. "Ce que je feray, Dieu aydant, en trois livres, au premier desquels sera décrit ce qui avoisine les deux Tropiques, au deuxieme ce qui est depuis le quarantieme degré jusques au cinquantieme et au troisieme les moeurs, facons et coutumes des peuples desquels nous avons à parler."

² In proof of this Lescarbot cites the "*Æquivoces*" of Xenophon. No such work ever existed. He drew his information from a volume of forged fragments published by Annus of Viterbo (Giovanni Nanni) at the close of the fifteenth century. In the edition printed by Ascensius at Paris in 1512 under the title of *Antiquitatum Variarum volumina XVII.*, the *De Æquivocis* occupies folios xxxiv to xli. The passage here referred to will be found on folio xxxvi *verso* while the accompanying commentary is on folios xxxvii and xxxviii.

³ *Histoire*, 1609, p. 27. "Duquel je représenteray les choses principales sans m'arreter à suivre le fil de son discours." Belleforest, *Cosmographie Universelle*, Paris, II. 2175-2178. This was a translation of Münster's work with additions.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 36. "Quelqu'un dit qu'estant parvenu au Cap Breton il fut pris et devoré par des Sauvages." In truth Ramusio does not say where his death took place, but only that it was on a subsequent voyage: "et nell' ultimo viaggio, che esto fece havendo voluto smontar in terra con alcuni compagni, furono tutti morti da quei popoli et in presentia di coloro, che erano rimasi nelle navi, furono arrostiti et mangiati." *Navigazioni et Viaggi*, Venice, 1556, III. fol. 417 *verso*.

⁵ "Mise en lumiere par M. Basanier, Gentil-homme françois Mathematicien." Cf. also the dedication to Ralegh. "Je l'ay tirée avec la diligence de Monsieur Hakluyt, homme certainement bien versé en l'histoire géographique . . . comme du tombeau, où elle avoit ja si longtemps inutile reposé," etc.

⁶ Bibliothèque Nationale MS. Fr. 15453, fol. 177 *verso*. "J'ay asses amplement

does not mention the work by name,¹ does not give the narrative in full, but while reproducing most of the details and some of the speeches usually contents himself with merely summarizing it.² He intersperses the narrative however with reflections of his own³ and in proof of his remarks cites Las Casas at some length on the cruelties inflicted by the Spaniards on the natives in Cuba.⁴ He also mentions the work of Acosta.⁵

In the remaining chapters of Book I. (numbers XXI.-XXX.) Lescarbot describes the attempt made by Villegagnon to form a settlement in Brazil. He had intended at first simply to give a résumé of the work published by de Léry who did not go out till 1556, but when the first part of his book was already in the printer's hands, fresh material was given him by one of his friends which enabled him to give details of the first voyage made in 1555.⁶ He was thus able to publish two letters written from Brazil by Nicolas Barré and printed at Paris in 1557.⁷ He gives only the second letter in full however and reserves that part of the first in which are described the country and the natives for his third book, on the

discours l'histoire des François occis à la Floride. . . . Il en y a une petite histoire imprimée l'année passée laquelle fidelement i'avois presté sur bonne foy a un certain Anglois nommé Richard Hakluit, écrite à la main, lequel l'ayant communiquée à un jeune homme Parisien nommé M. Basanier, me la tindrent quatre mois ou environ, au bout duquel temps le firent imprimer a Paris. J'ay icy a me condoloir avec mes amis contre ces plagiaires et imposteurs. . . . Ayant commis . . . telle vilainie en mon endroit tous deux m'apportèrent l'un des livres qu'ils firent imprimer pensans me gratifier avec ma copie bien écrite, lequel livre ils dedirent a un Chevalier Milort d'Angleterre nommé Walter Ralegh," etc. Cf. also MS. Fr. 15454, fol. 148.

¹ *Histoire*, etc., p. 39. "Que l'historien de ce voyage appelle Roy," etc.

² *Ibid.*, p. 62. "Je ne vaux m'arrêter a toutes les particularités de ce qui s'est passé en ce voyage, craignant d'ennuyer le lecteur en la trop grande curiosité mais seulement aux choses plus generales et plus digne d'estre sçeuës." Cf. p. 45.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 51. "En quoy ie conjecture que dés le mois de janvier ilz m'avoient plus rien." Cf. pp. 58, 104, 126.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 121. "Je m'en rapporte à ce qu'en a écrit Dom. Barthelemi de las Casas," etc. Cf. also pp. 122 et seqq. "Cet autheur nous a laissé un Recueil ou abrégé intitulé *Destruction des Indes par Les Hespagnols*," etc.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 127. "Je les r'envoye à un autre qui a décrit l'histoire naturele et morale des Indes tant Orientales qu'Occidentales, Joseph Acosta lequel," etc. Cf. also p. 173.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 147. "Le Roy . . . fit donner à Villegagnon deux beaux navires . . . pour faire son voyage. Duquel i'avois omis les particularitez pour n'en avoir sceu recouvrer les memoires, mais sur le point que l'Imprimeur achevoit ce qui est de la Floride un de mes amis m'en a fourni de bien amples, lesquels en ce temps-là ont esté envoyez par deça de la France Antarctique par un des gens dudit sieur de Villegagnon."

⁷ *Copie de quelques Lettres sur la Navigation du Chevalier de Villegaignon es terres de l'Amérique oultre l'oequinocial, iusques soubz le tropique de Capricorne; contenant sommairement les fortunes encourues en ce voyage avec les moeurs et façons de vivre des Sauvages du pais; envoyées par un des gens dudit seigneur*, Paris, 1557. They will also be found in Ternaux-Compans, *Archives des Voyages*, Paris, 1843, I. 102-116, and in Gaffarel, *Histoire du Brésil Français au Seizième Siècle*, Paris, 1878, pp. 373-385.

manners and customs of the savages.¹ Chapters XXIII. to XXX., describing the despatch of the Genevan Huguenots and the subsequent failure of the colony, are taken from the work published by de Léry in 1578 and reprinted in 1580.² As in the case of Laudonnière's work however Lescarbot contents himself with relating merely the principal events, at the same time keeping up a running comment of his own.³ In this connection he cites also the works of Peter Martyr⁴ and André Thevet.⁵

Book II. describes the expeditions of Cartier, Roberval, de la Roche and the voyage made by Champlain to the St. Lawrence in the year 1603. Cartier's first two voyages in 1534 and 1535 are given in full. Lescarbot took his version of the first voyage from the French translation of Ramusio published at Rouen in 1598.⁶ He also printed some verses on the voyage to Canada which were published with that edition.⁷ In copying this account he for some reason put the "first of August" for the "twenty-fourth of July" and afterwards gave no more dates until the end of the voyage.⁸ His account of Cartier's second voyage is taken from Manuscript No. 5589 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, which he tells us was the very original presented by Cartier to Francis the First.⁹ He modern-

¹ *Histoire*, etc., p. 156. "Quant à ce qui est des mœurs et coutumes des Bresiliens et du rapport de la terre, nous recueillerons au dernier livre ce que l'auteur du Memoire sus-écrit en a dit."

² *Histoire d'un Voyage fait en la Terre du Bresil, autrement dite Amerique contenant la navigation et choses remarquables, vues sur mer par l'auteur; le comportement de Villegagnon en ce pays là, les mœurs et façons de vivre estranges des sauvages américains; avec un colloque de leur langage, ensemble la description de plusieurs animaux, herbes et autres choses singulieres; et du tout inconnues par deça; dont on verra les sommaires dans les chapitres au commencement du livre. Le tout recueilli sur les lieux par Jean de Léry, natif de la Margelle, terre de Saint-Sene, au duché de Bourgogne, La Rochelle, 1578.* The edition published at Geneva in 1580 was reprinted by M. Gaffarel at Paris in 1880.

³ *Histoire*, p. 165, "Quoy que je ne me veuille arrêter à toutes les particularitez qu'a écrit Jean de Lery, auteur de l'histoire de ce voyage;" and p. 170, "Jean de Lery cherchant la raison de cela, presuppose, etc. Or ie ne puis bonnement m'y accorder," etc. Cf. also pp. 186, 202.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 167. "Suivant le rapport qu'en fait Pierre Martyr, celui qui a écrit l'histoire des Indes Occidentales, lequel en parle en cette sorte," etc.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 208. "Es chartes geographiques qu'André Thevet fit imprimer au retour de ce pays là," etc.

⁶ *Histoire*, p. 231. "Ainsi i'ay laissé en leur entier les deux voyages dudit Capitaine Jacques Quartier; le premier desquels estoit imprimé." This edition is entitled: *Discours du Voyage fait par le Capitaine Jacques Cartier aux Terresneufves de Canadas, Norembegue, Hochelage, Labrador, et pays adiacens, dite nouvelle France, avec particulieres mœurs, langage, et ceremonies des habitans d'icelle*, Rouen, 1598. It was reprinted by M. Michelant at Paris in 1865.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 232. "Au surplus ayant trouvé en tête du premier voyage du Capitaine Jacques Quartier quelques vers François, ie n'en ay voulu fruster l'auteur, duquel i'eusse mis le nom s'il se fust donné à connoître."

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 278 et seqq. Michelant's edition, pp. 56 et seqq. Cf. p. 285.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 231. "Mais le second ie l'ay pris sur l'original présenté au Roy écrit à

izes the spelling, however, and also suppressed some of the dedication which seemed to him too bigoted.¹ Moreover, he does not give this relation continuously but breaks it up into sections between which he inserts portions of Champlain's account of his voyage to the St. Lawrence in the year 1603.² Thus before beginning Cartier's relation he gives a summary of Champlain's voyage as far as the island of Anticosti. He then gives the dedication of Cartier's relation and the account of his voyage until he reached Tadoussac. "Let us now," he continues, "leave Captain Cartier with the savages at Tadoussac while we go and meet Champlain whom we left at Anticosti."³ After giving Champlain's account of his voyage from Anticosti to Tadoussac he again takes up Cartier, whom he follows up the river to Stadacona and Ste. Croix.⁴ After bringing Champlain to the same spot,⁵ he takes them each in turn to the rapids of Lachine and back again. His reason for bringing out in such contrast these two voyages, over the same ground, was because this portion of Cartier's voyage had been forgotten and people were then of the opinion that Champlain was the first who had gone as far as the Rapids. Although Lescarbot does not wish to detract unnecessarily from Champlain's credit, who had himself been under the same impression,⁶ yet he wishes to see justice done to Cartier.⁷ Be-

la main, couvert en satin bleu." Cf. Biggar, *The Early Trading Companies of New France*, Toronto, 1900, the appendix on Cartier's Voyages.

¹ *Ibid.*, Au Lecteur, "Pour l'Orthographe j'ay suivi la plus simple qu'il m'esté possible rejettant à peu pres toutes lettres superflus." It seems strange therefore to speak of Lescarbot's version of Cartier's voyages.

² *Ibid.*, p. 287. "Et d'autant que le voyage du sieur Champlain fait depuis six ans est une même chose avec cetui-ci, je les conjoindray ensemble tant qu'il me sera possible, pour ne remplir inutilement le papier de vaines repetitions." This voyage is entitled *Des Sauvages ou Voyage de Samuel Champlain de Brouage, fait en la France Nouvelle l'an mil six cens trois*, etc., Paris, n. d.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 304. "Or maintenant laissons le Capitaine Jacques Quartier deviser avec ses Sauvages au Port de la riviere de Saguenay, qui est Tadoussac, et allons au devant du sieur Champlain, lequel nous avons ci dessus laissé à Anticosti . . . car il nous décrira ledit Port de Tadoussac," etc.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 325. "Laissons maintenant le sieur Champlain faire la *Tabagie* . . . et discourir de la Theologie avec les Sagamos . . . et allons reprendre le Capitaine Jacques Quartier lequel nous veut mener à-mont la riviere de Canada jusques à Sainte Croix."

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 341. "Or devant que nôtre Capitaine Jacques Quartier s'embarque pour faire son voyage, allons querir le sieur Champlain, lequel nous avons laissé à Tadoussac . . . Nous le lairrons en garnison à Sainte Croix, tandis que ledit Capitaine fera la decouverte de la grande riviere jusques au Saut et à Hochelaga."

⁶ Champlain indeed had made this statement in his *Des Sauvages*. Vid. *Œuvres de Champlain*, II. 27. "Et une autre riviere du meme costé . . . qui est celle où fut Jacques Cartier au commencement de la decouverte qu'il en fait et ne passa point plus outre." Palma Cayet added in 1605 "ni autre après luy que en ce voyage." *Chronologie Septenaire*, Paris, 1836, p. 453.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 346. "Ainsi des faits de plusieurs personnages, desquels la memoire se

sides, each did not observe the same points so that to get the whole truth one must hear all the witnesses.¹ After telling the story of Cartier's winter at Ste. Croix and of his return to France in the spring of 1536,² he concludes this part of his work with the description given by Champlain of his voyage home in 1603.³ The story of the Gougou, however, excites his mirth rather than his credulity and he also makes fun of Palma Cayet for printing it as valid.⁴ In Chapter XXIX., which is given up to personal observations on the accounts of Cartier and of Champlain, he corrects some faults in Belleforest⁵ and at the same time expresses his belief in that portion of Cartier's relation which describes the Kingdom of Saguenay, although the facts sounded exceedingly strange.⁶ He cites here the work of Jean Alfonse⁷ and also that of Wytfliet.⁸

All Lescarbot's information about Roberval is taken from the slight mention of that expedition in the letters patent granted to de la Roche⁹ and from what he gleaned in conversation with one of Roberval's descendants.¹⁰ He states erroneously, however, that

pert bien souvent avec les hommes et sont frustrez de la loïiange qui leur appartient. Et pour n'aller chercher des exemples externes, le voyage de nôtre Capitaine Jacques Quartier depuis Sainte Croix jusques au Saut de la grande riviere, estoit inconnu en ce temps ici . . . si bien que le sieur Champlain pensoit estre le premier qui en avoit gaigné le pris. Mais il faut rendre à chacun ce qui lui appartient et suivant ce, dire que ledit Champlain a ignoré l'histoire du voyage dedit Jacques Quartier. Et neantmoins ne laisse point d'estre loïiable en ce qu'il a fait. Mais je m' étonne que le sieur du Pont . . . ait ignoré cela," etc. Cf. also pp. 365-366.

¹ *Histoire*, p. 366. "Car En la bouche de deux ou trois témoins toute parole sera resoluë et arretée."

² *Ibid.*, p. 386. "Mais avant que ce faire, nous reciterons ce que ledit Capitaine Quartier rapporte en general des merveilles du grand fleuve de Canada," etc.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 415. "Ayans r'amené le Capitaine Jacques Quartier en France, il nous faut retourner querir le sieur Champlain . . . à fin qu'il nous dise quelques nouvelles de ce qu'il aura veu et ouï parmi les Sauvages depuis que nous l'avons quitté."

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 420. "Toutes lesquelles choses ledit Champlain a depuis reconu estre fabuleuses;" also p. 424, "Un sçavant personnage . . . est encore en plus grand' faute, ayant mis . . . tout le discours dudit Champlain sans nommer son auteur et ayant baillé les fables . . . pour bonne monnoye." Cf. Palma Cayet, *Chronologie Septenaire*, Paris, 1836, pp. 450 et seqq.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 425. "Lesquels écrivent sans rien digérer : de quoy i' accuserois aucunement le sieur de Belle-forest n' estoit la reverence que porte à sa memoire." Cf. Münster, *Cosmographie Universelle*, translated by Belleforest, Paris, 1575, folio II. 2184 et seqq.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 428. "Quelqu'un pourroit accuser . . . Quartier d'avoir fait des contes de Pline, quand il dit . . . qu'ès pais de Saguenay il y a des hommes accoutrez de draps de laine," etc. But "Ces terres là ne sont point si bien découvertes qu' on puisse sçavoir tout ce qui y est. Pour le reste il a son auteur . . . lequel avoit couru des grandes contrées toute sa vie," etc.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 529.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 526.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 433. "Or par ladite Commission se reconoit que quatre ans apres . . . Quartier le même Roy François premier donna pouvoir à Jean François de la Roque," etc.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 433. Ausquelles faits de guerres ce Roberval acquit tant de credit . . .

Roberval and his brother made a second expedition when the wars at home were over, and that in this they both lost their lives.¹ He could also find no account of the expedition of de la Roche, which he places in the year 1596, so contented himself with printing his commission after the edition published at Rouen in 1598.²

The remainder of Book II. (Chap. XXXI.-XLVIII.) gives the history of de Monts's attempt to colonize Acadia. This, the only original part of the work, is also the most important, for it supplements in many places the account of the same given by Champ-lain.³ In Chapter XXXI. Lescarbot gives the commission of de Monts after an edition published in Paris in 1605 and of which a copy is preserved in the archives of the French Foreign Office.⁴ Chapters XXXII. to XXXVIII. tell the story of the departure of the colonists from France, of the search for a suitable spot for settlement, of the choice of the Island of Ste. Croix, of the winter spent there and finally of the removal of the colony to Port Royal. Since during this period Lescarbot was still in France he must have received his information from some of those who took part in these events. Among the chief of these was probably de Poutrincourt, for we have a number of details of his voyage out⁵ and back.⁶ The events in the colony during the year 1605, when de Poutrincourt was absent, were obtained doubtless from de Monts or from one of his men.⁷ It is possible indeed that Lescarbot even had at his disposal a diary kept by some one on the voyage or otherwise he would not have been able to give the exact dates of so many events.⁸ Chapters XXXIX. to XLVIII. contain an account of

que le Roy l'appelloit Le petit Roy de Vimeu, à ce que j'ay entendu du sieur De la Roque à present Prevôt de Vimeu, qui se dit de la parenté dudit sieur de Roberval."

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 434: "Après que les guerres eurent pris quelque *interim* par deçà, ces deux champions . . . équiperent quelque navire pour continuer l'entreprise et sont encore à revenir." For a good life of Roberval see Abbé E. Morel, *Jean François de la Roque, Seigneur de Roberval*, in the *Bulletin de Géographie Historique et Descriptive*, Paris, 1892, pp. 273-296.

² *Ibid.*, p. 431. "De la Roche duquel nous n'avons point de memoire qu'il ait rien fait, sinon d'avoir déchargé quelques 40 hommes à l'île de Sable." Cf. also p. 18. Michelant et Ramé, *Voyage de Cartier au Canada en 1534*, Paris, 1865, p. 3. "Ayant ces iours passez imprimé l'Edict du Roy contenant le pouvoir et commission donnee par sa Maiesté au sieur Marquis de la Roche pour la conqueste des terres-neufves, de Norembergue," etc. Lescarbot uses the same title. Cf. *Histoire*, p. 434.

³ Laverdière, *Œuvres de Champlain*, Tome III., Chap. II.-XI.

⁴ *Amérique*, Vol. IV.

⁵ *Histoire*, pp. 473-499.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 499 et *seqq.* "Par ainsi les navires estans prêts à partir pour le retour, de Poutrincourt se mit . . . dedans l'un d'iceux . . . Le voyage ne fut sans tourmente et grands perils. Car entre autres i'en reciteray deux ou trois," etc.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 503-505, 525, 530-532, 534-539.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 474, "le septième jour de Mars;" p. 475, "le sixième de May;" p. 476, "la dixième de Mars;" p. 486, "le vingt quatrième Juin," etc.

Lescarbot's own voyage to Port Royal, of his life there during the winter of 1606-1607 and of his return to France in the autumn of the latter year. Here, where he is recounting events in which he himself took part, Lescarbot is certainly at his best. His gaiety,¹ his inquisitive mind,² his original way at looking at things,³ all come out clearly in these chapters of his work. He evidently kept a diary of his own in order to be able to reproduce so faithfully the dates of the principal events.⁴ After describing what took place at Port Royal on their arrival and during the absence of de Poutrincourt on a voyage of discovery when he himself was left in charge of the colony,⁵ he gives a short description of this voyage.⁶ Champlain's account however is more complete for he formed part of the company.⁷ Lescarbot does not go into great detail as to the events of the winter.⁸ He has told us elsewhere however that after the day's work was over, he himself used to retire to his study where he wrote or read. He had brought with him a small collection of books as well as his Bible out of which, indeed, at de Poutrincourt's request, he preached to the company every Sunday.⁹ In thus replacing the regular priest who had died before their arrival,¹⁰ Lescarbot seems to have thumbed his Bible

¹ *Histoire*, p. 563. "Nous ne laissons pourtant de rire la pluspart."

² *Ibid.*, p. 556. "Il me vint en memoire l'ancienne coutume des Chrétiens, lesquels allans en voyage portoient avec eux le sacré pain de l'Eucharistie . . . ie demanday si on nous voudrait faire de même," etc.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 545 *et seqq.*, where are printed his verses "*Adieu à la France*."

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 545, "le lendemain de nôtre arrivée qui fut le troisième jour d'avril;" p. 558, "l'onzième de May" and "le Samedi . . . treizième de May;" p. 559, le seizième jour de May;" p. 565, "Depuis que nous eumes quitté ces Forbans, nous fumes jusques au dix-huitième de juin agitez de vents;" p. 567, "Et le 21 dudit mois;" p. 569, "ce qui occasionna de jeter la sonde par un jeudi vingt deuxième de Juin;" p. 575, "Le quatrième de Juillet noz matelots . . . appareurent dès le grand matin les îles Saint Pierre;" p. 584, "Il arriva le Lundi dernier jour de Juillet et demeura . . . au Port Royal jusques au vingt huitième d'Aoust," etc.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 590. "L'estois demeuré, ayant esté de ce prié pour avoir l'œil à la maison et maintenir ce qui y restoit de gens en concorde."

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 589-617.

⁷ Laverdière, *Œuvres de Champlain*, Tome III., Chaps. XIII-XV.

⁸ *Histoire*, etc., pp. 618-619. "Ce seroit chose longue de vouloir minuter tout ce qui se faisoit durant l'hiver."

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 518-519. "Car chacun estant retiré au soir, parmi les caquets, bruits et tintamares, j'estois enclous en mon étude lisant ou écrivant quelque chose. Mêmes ie ne seray point honteux de dire qu'ayant esté prié par le sieur de Poutrincourt nôtre chef de donner quelques heures de mon industrie à enseigner Chrétiennement nôtre petit peuple, pour ne vivre en bêtes, et pour donner exemple de nôtre façon de vivre aux Sauvages, ie l'ay fait . . . par chacun Dimanche, et quelquefois extraordinairement préqué tout le temps que nous y avons esté. Et bien me vint que j'avois porté ma Bible et quelques livres, sans y penser: Car autrement cela m'eust fort fatigué, et eust esté cause que ie m'en serois excusé."

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 556. "N'y estant demeuré qu'un Prêtre en la demeure de la Nouvelle France lequel on nous dit estre mort quand nous arrivames là."

well, for in his history he cites it at very frequent intervals.¹ He brings this portion of his history to a close with an account of the arrival of Chevalier, of the preparations for departure and of the return voyage from Canso to St. Malo.² After a visit to Mont St. Michel which he calls the "eighth wonder of the world," he and de Poutrincourt embarked again at St. Malo in a small vessel for Honfleur whence they made their way to Paris.³

Of what took place in the Bay of Fundy in the summer of 1608, the year after his return, he was able to obtain information from Champdoré and others,⁴ but since Champlain had remained during the winter of 1608 and 1609 at Quebec, Lescarbot was unable to give an account of events in the St. Lawrence.⁵ His account of Champdoré's return to Acadia is however a very summary one.

Book III. is given up entirely to a description of the manners and customs of the Savages of the New World.⁶ Since he had not thought of publishing a work when he was in the country,⁷ he had to rely for his information on what he could recall from memory, on his journal (if he really had one), and on what he found in other writers. In the course of his remarks on the births, marriages, deaths, wars, funerals, virtues and vices of the Indians he cites again Laudonnière,⁸ de Léry,⁹ Cartier,¹⁰ and Champlain¹¹ and also makes

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 49, 198-199, 484, 519, 523, 537, 555, etc.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 629-650.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 650. "Ayans demeuré trois au quatre jours à Saint Malo, nous allames . . . au Mont Saint Michel . . . Quant au bâtiment il merite d'estre appellé la huitième merveille du monde," etc.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 652. "Lesdits navires estans de retour, nous avons eu rapport par le sieur de Champdoré et autres de l'état du païs que nous avons laissé," etc.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 654. "Le sieur Champlain est . . . en la grande riviere de Canada . . . où il s'est fortifié, ayant mené des menages avec du bestial, et diverses sortes d'arbres fruitiers . . . Il n'est pas homme pour demeurer en repos, et attendons bientôt nouvelles de l'entiere decouverte de cette grande et nompareille riviere et des païs qu'elle arrouse par la diligence dudit Champlain."

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 661. "Il m'a semblé necessaire de m'exercer en ce troisieme livre sur ce sujet (la maniere de vivre) pour ce qui regarde les nations desquelles nous avons parlé," etc.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 663. "Lors que i'estois pardela ne pensant rien moins qu'a cette histoire ie n'ay pas pris garde à beaucoup de choses que i'auroy peu observer."

⁸ *Histoire*, etc., p. 683. "Le Capitaine Laudonniere en son histoire de la Floride dit," etc. Cf. also pp. 688, 724, 747, 757, 786, 796.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 665. "Les Bresiliens à ce que dit Jean de Leri, lequel i'ayme mieux suivre en ce qu'il a veu qu'un Hespagnol," etc. Cf. also pp. 684, 685, 693, 747.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 673 et seqq. "Jacques Quartier en sa deuxième Relation rapporte ce qui i'ay n'agueres dit en ces mots, qui ne sont pas couchez ci dessus au livre second," etc. Cf. also pp. 744, 853.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 674. "Le sieur Champlain . . . fait rapport," etc. Cf. also pp. 725, 853.

use of Belleforest,¹ Acosta,² Gomara,³ Pigafetta⁴ and Hariot.⁵ His method of procedure is as a rule to give the custom of the Greeks, Romans, Hebrews, Gauls or Germans in the matter and then to contrast with this that of the savages of the New World. He thus makes use of a great number of classical writers among whom one might cite Hesiod, Herodotus, Plato, Xenophon, Aristotle, Polybius, Strabo, Plutarch, Hippocrates, Heliodorus, Oppian, Athenaeus, Pausanias, Theophrastus, Diodorus Siculus and Arrian as well as Plautus, Caesar, Cicero, Livy, Virgil, Tacitus, Pliny, Aulus Gellius, Claudian, Ammianus Marcellinus, Sidonius, Procopius and Josephus. He seems also to be familiar with the early Christian fathers and cites Tertullian, St. Augustine, St. Isidore and St. Jerome. Among more modern writers he makes mention after Jean de Meung and Joinville of Olaus Magnus,⁶ Oribasius,⁷ Annii of Viterbo,⁸ Busbecq⁹ and the Seigneur des Accords.¹⁰

The small volume of verses entitled *Les Muses de la Nouvelle France* which is generally found bound up with the history contains nothing of very great interest. There is a Pindaric ode to King Henry IV., an ode each to de Monts and de Poutrincourt; while Champdoré is honored with a sonnet. The other verses were written to celebrate special events; as the departure of the vessel

¹ *Histoire*, p. 683. "Et toutesfois le sieur de Belle-forest écrit avoir pris de ladite histoire ce qu'il met en avant," etc. Cf. also pp. 728, 849.

² *Ibid.*, p. 688. "Ainsi qu'en discours amplement Joseph Acosta," etc. Cf. also pp. 725, 813, 818, 836.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 680. "L'Histoire generale des Indes Occidentales rapporte," etc. A French translation of Gomara was published under this title at Paris by Martin Fumée in 1569 and reprinted in 1578, 1580 and 1584.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 715. "Lesquels Pighafatte en son Voyage autour du monde dit," etc. This work which was published at Paris with no date is entitled *Le Voyage et Navigation faict par les Espaignolz es isles de Mollucques (de 1519 à 1522): Des isles quilz ont trouue audict voyage, des roys dicelles, de leur gouvernement et maniere de vivre avec plusieurs aultres choses*.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 698. "Car l'auteur de l'histoire de la Virginie dit," etc. Cf. also pp. 729, 872. A French translation of Hariot's work appeared in 1590 in the first volume of Bry's large collection of voyages.

⁶ *Histoire*, p. 508. "Et si on veut encore ouïr le temoignage d'Olaus Magnus," etc. The work referred to is his *Historia de Gentibus Septentrionalibus*, Rome, 1555.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 761. "Car le vin . . . dit Oribasius," etc. *Oribasii Collectaneorum Artis Medicae liber, quo totius corporis humani sectio explicatur*, Paris, 1556.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 788. "Et l'a fort bien remarqué Jean Annii de Viterbe." He is really citing his edition of Berosus which was published at Antwerp in 1552 under the title of *Berosi antiquitatum Italiae ac totius orbis libri V. commentariis Joannis Annii Viterbensis illustrati adjecto nunc primum indice locupletissimo et reliquis ejus argumenti autoribus*.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 775. "Ce qu'écrit le sieur de Busbeque au discours de son ambassade en Turquie." It is his *Itinera Constantinopolitanum et Amasianum*, published at Antwerp in 1581.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 875. "Le sieur des Accords . . . recite," etc. The work is his *Les Touches* published at Paris in 1585.

for home in August 1606, the return of de Poutrincourt from his voyage of discovery to the South in the autumn of that year and finally Lescarbot's own departure from New France in the summer of 1607.

Upon its appearance Lescarbot's work at once met with a good reception. It described interesting events and was written in an agreeable manner. The author was not a pedant but on the contrary one who enjoyed a good story. He himself took delight in what he related and his own questions, conjectures and observations give one pleasure even to this day. It is not surprising therefore that an English and a German translation of the work soon appeared. The first was done at Hakluyt's request by P. Erondelle who seems to have been a Huguenot pastor in London.¹ He only translated however that portion of the work which dealt with the settlements at Ste. Croix and Port Royal and the last book, on the manners and customs of the savages. The translation, which was dedicated to Prince Henry, was made "to the end that comparing the goodnesse of the lands of the Northerly parts with Virginia, greater encouragement might be given to prosecute that generous and godly action."² The Chapters XXXI. to XLVIII. of Book II. form the first book of the English edition, while Book III. of the French edition forms the second. Lescarbot's name however is nowhere given. The translation seems to be well done and the work must have been of great interest to English readers at the time of its appearance.

The German translation, which did not appear until 1613, gives only a brief summary in some eighty pages of the whole of the original.³ This abridgment was published by a Catholic nobleman for the benefit of his co-religionists.⁴

Shortly after the publication of his history, Lescarbot was thrown into prison on the charge of having written a work against the Jesuits.⁵ Whether guilty or not, he was soon released, for in the au-

¹ *Nova Francia or the Description of that part of New France which is one continent with Virginia. Translated out of French into English by P. E.*, London, 1609. Cf. HARRISSE, *Notes pour servir à l'Histoire, à la Bibliographie, etc., de la Nouvelle France*, Paris, 1872, p. 25.

² To the Reader.

³ Marc Lescarbot, *Nova Francia: Gründliche History von Erfündung der grossen Landschaft Nova Francia oder New Frankreich genannt. Aus einem zu Paris gedruckten Französischen Buch in Teutsch gebracht*, Augsburg, 1613.

⁴ Preface. "Also hat sich ein Fürnemer Edler . . . leichtlich erbitten lassen, den Catholischen zu gutem vorgemeldtes Buch in das Teutsch zubringen."

⁵ L'Estoile, *Mémoires-Journaux*, Paris, 1881, X. 88. "Un advocat de mes amis nommé Lescarbot en peine et en prison pour le Mastigophore de Fuzy à la suscitation, ainsi qu'on disoit, et par la trahison d'un imprimeur nommé Langlois." Cf. also pp. 87 *et seqq.* The work referred to is entitled: *Le Mastigophore ou précurseur du Zodiaque*,

tumn of 1610 appeared his *Conversion des Sauvages*, in which he gave an account of de Poutrincourt's return to Port Royal and of his efforts after his arrival to convert the savages in the neighborhood.¹ It was doubtless Saint-Just, who had come to France that summer with a load of furs, who furnished Lescarbot with most of his facts.²

In the year 1611 Lescarbot brought out a new edition of his history in an enlarged and corrected form. The corrections consisted of a fresh dedication to the new king, Louis XIII., and he also placed the voyage of de la Roche in the year 1598 instead of 1596. By means of the official statement of Cartier's expenditure communicated to him by Samuel Georges of La Rochelle, who had been a shareholder in De Mont's company, he was also able to add a few more facts about Roberval.³ He also gave for the first time Cartier's commission for his third voyage.⁴ He inserted further a new chapter on the attempt of de la Jannaye and Nouel to obtain a monopoly of the fur trade in 1588, which had not been mentioned in the first edition.⁵ Indeed the whole work now formed six books instead of three. Book I. is composed of the first twenty chapters of the first edition, while Chapters XXI. to XXX. of the same make up Book II. Chapters I. to XXX. of the old Book II. now form Book III., while the remaining chapters of that book, Nos. XXXI. to XLVIII., form the new Book IV., but there are no changes in the text. These four books thus cover the ground gone over in Books I. and II. of the first edition. He now added an account in six chapters of Champlain's achievements in the St. Lawrence since the year 1608 and of de Poutrincourt's return to Port Royal in 1610 out of which he formed Book V. His account of events in the St. Lawrence was given to him by Champlain himself,⁶ while for the Acadian portion of the Book he uses his own *Conversion des Sauv-*

auquel par manière apologétique sont brisées les brides à veaux de maistre Juvain Solanique pénitent repent, seigneur de Morddreet et d'Amplademus en partie, du côté de la mouë; traduit du latin en françois par maistre Victor Grevé, géographe microcosmique, n.p., 1609. According to Brunet the author was a certain Fusi, curé of St. Leu-et-St. Giles at Paris, and the work was directed against one of his churchwardens.

¹ *La Conversion des Sauvages qui ont esté baptizés en la Nouvelle France cette année 1610 avec un Bref Recit du Voyage du sieur de Poutrincourt*, Paris, n.d.

² Saint-Just reached France on August 21. *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, Cleveland, 1896, II. 140. The privilege for printing *La Conversion* is dated September 9.

³ *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, 1611, p. 410. "Ainsi que ie trouve par le compte rendu desdits denieres par ledit Quartier, qui m'a esté communiqué par le sieur Samuel Georges Bourgeois de Rochelle." Cf. also p. 517.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 411-416.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 417-419.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 631, "Selon que m'a recité ledit Champlain;" p. 632, "Au recit dudit Champlain;" p. 663, "Ce qu'ayant entendu de la bouche dudit Champlain," etc.

ages. Book III. of the edition of 1609, on the manners and customs of the savages, forms the new Book VI., and does not seem to have been altered. In the volume of verses called the *Muses* he has added a sonnet to Champlain, an ode in memory of Captain Gourgues and some lines on the death of a savage in Florida who had offered to give his life for the French.

On account of Lescarbot's not being present when the printing of this edition was begun, several errors crept in which were corrected in the edition published in 1612.¹ The absence of the table of errata seems indeed the only difference between these editions. That of 1612 was reprinted at Paris in 1866 with an introduction by M. Tross.

In the same year 1612 Lescarbot published his *Relation Dernière*.² This is a small pamphlet of forty pages containing an account of de Poutrincourt's return to Port Royal in 1610 and of the principal events which had taken place there since that date. Although he had already given some account of these events in his *Conversion des Sauvages* as well as in the fifth chapter of Book V. of his history as published in 1611, yet he now goes over the same ground again, although he adds a notice of events up to June 1611. It was in that month indeed that de Poutrincourt had set sail for home and it was doubtless he who recounted to Lescarbot all that is here described. It was also no doubt at de Poutrincourt's request that special stress was laid upon the conversion effected among the savages for he hoped on account of this to receive some aid from the King in his undertaking.

During the years 1612 to 1614 Lescarbot was in Switzerland in the suite of Pierre de Castille the French ambassador to that republic who was afterwards appointed intendant of finances in France.³ During his leisure hours Lescarbot composed some verses on the country, which however he did not publish until the year 1618.⁴

¹ *Les Muses*, etc., p. 66. "L'auteur n'ayant peu estre present au commencement de l'impression, quelques fautes sont survenues en icelle," etc.

² *Relation Dernière de ce qui s'est passé au voyage du sieur de Poutrincourt en la Nouvelle France depuis 20 mois ença*, Paris, 1612.

³ *Histoire*, 1617, p. 678, "du quinzième May mille six cens treze, moy étant en Suisse." Cf. also p. 684, "que ie receu de sa part l'an suivant mille six cens quatorze, étant encore en Suisse."

⁴ *Le Tableau de la Suisse et autres alliez de la France es hautes Allemagnes auquel sont descrites les singularités des Alpes, et rapportées les diverses alliances des Suisses; particulièrement celles qu'ils ont avec la France*, Paris, 1618. In the dedicatory epistle to de Castille written at the opening of the year 1614 he says that he had already been there two years. "Ayant eu l'honneur et contentement d'avoir veu . . . depuis deux ans ença, le sit et naturel de ce pais," etc. *Les Bains des Feffers* on pages 48 et seqq. was published separately in 1613 at Lyon.

How Lescarbot occupied his time on his return from Switzerland we do not know, but it was not until the year 1617 that he brought out a third and further enlarged edition of his history of New France. The first four books and the last, Book VI., however, are the same as in the previous edition (except that Chapters III. and IV. of this last are rolled into one), so that all the fresh material is given in Book V. Indeed this book, which in the edition of 1611 only contained six chapters, now possesses fifteen. Although part of this fresh material (viz., Chaps. IX. and X.) is only a repetition of his *Conversion des Sauvages* and *Relation Dernière*, and other chapters (III. to VII.) are formed by subdividing former ones (viz., old Chaps. III. and IV.), yet part of the material at the end of this book is absolutely new. Thus in Chapters XI. to XV. he gives for the first time an account of the disputes between Saint-Just and the Jesuits as well as of the attempt of the latter to form a fresh settlement at St. Sauveur and of their capture by Argall. Part of this he obtained from the *Factum*¹ and from Biard's *Relation*² which had appeared in the previous year, while he also makes use of some letters sent to him from Port Royal in 1614.³ Furthermore he prints a procès-verbal drawn up at La Rochelle in July 1614.⁴ The account of Champlain's operations in the St. Lawrence, begun in the edition of 1611, is continued and in much greater detail. These dates and other matters now given for the first time are taken from the volume published by Champlain in the year 1613.⁵ Some of the facts relating to Champlain's voyage up the Ottawa in the summer of 1613 had however been given to Lescarbot by a Norman friend.⁶ Further than the year 1613 he does not go for events in the St. Lawrence.

Les Muses de la Nouvelle France, dated 1618, contains no

¹ *Histoire*, 1617, p. 677, "laquelle est couchée tout au long au Factum du sieur de Poutrincourt," etc. Cf. also p. 678. This factum appeared in the year 1614 under the title *Factum du Procès entre Jean de Biencourt chevalier Sieur de Poutrincourt Baron de S. Just appellant d'une part et Pierre Biard, Evemond Massé et Consorts soy disans Prestres de la Socièté de Jésus, intimez*.

² *Ibid.*, p. 676. "Le même pere Biard passe sous silence sept mois de temps," etc. Cf. p. 668, "car le Pere Biard n'en fait aucune mention," etc. Biard's *Relation* was published at Lyons in 1616 under the title *Relation de la Nouvelle France, de ses terres, naturel du pays et de ses habitants, item du voyage des Pères Jésuites ausdites contrées et de ce qu'ils y ont fait jusques à leur prise par les Anglais*.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 678-679, 684-685.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 687-690.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 615-616, "Champlain racontant ce fait;" p. 619, "à ce que dit Champlain." Cf. also pp. 620, 634, 647.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 647. "Les particularités de ce dernier voyage m'ayans été recitées par un Gentil-homme Norman . . . ie les ay depuis trouvées vérifiées par la relation qu'en a fait trop au long ledit Champlain," etc.

changes from the edition published in 1611. Editions also of the History dated 1618 only differ from the edition of 1617 in the correction of the errata and the consequent absence of this leaf.

In the same year 1618, in which also appeared his *Tableau de la Suisse* mentioned above, Lescarbot published a small pamphlet on the fall of Concini from power.¹ After congratulating Louis XIII. on his courage in getting rid of such a pest,² he urges him to put an end to the Turkish empire³ and to subdue the peoples of New France.⁴

After Lescarbot's marriage, which took place in the following year, doubtless as a result of his appointment to the post of naval commissioner,⁵ we hear nothing more of him until the year 1629, when he published a small volume of verse on the defeat of the English at La Rochelle.⁶ On the title-page he calls himself "Marc Lescarbot Esquire Seigneur de Wiencourt et de Saint Audebert." This title he inherited though his wife Françoise de Valpergue though in what year we do not know.⁷ This is the last production from Lescarbot's pen but the date of his death is not yet known.

Such then are the life and works of the first historian of New France. In contrast with the aridity of the Jesuit Relations and with the prolific geographical details given by Champlain, Lescarbot's bright and pleasant manner of recounting his adventures in the New World give even the reader of the present day a keen pleasure. His original way of looking at things, his poetical vein and above all the continual good humor which bubbles out all through his work, leave upon one the impression of a jovial companion and an intelligent conversationalist. Possessed of the true philosophic spirit he was as happy at Port Royal cultivating his garden and

¹ *Le Franc Gaulois au Roy, Sur le Repos de la France*, Paris, 1618. Another copy is entitled *Le Bout de l'An Sur le Repos de la France*, etc. Copies of these are preserved at the Bibliothèque Nationale, L. b³⁶ 1118 and 1119. Lescarbot had also signed the dedication of the *Tableau de la Suisse* to the king, "le Franc Gaulois." This pamphlet itself however is signed "Marc Lescarbot."

² *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4, "Toutes nations s'estonnoient de voir maistriser dan vostre Louvre un faquin . . . Il s'estoit à vos depens asservi voz villes . . . il dispoisoit de la paix et de la guerre. Il gouvernoit vos finances et vos armées et nous faisoit égorger les uns les autres," etc.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 12. "Il faut ruiner l'Empire de Mahomet."

⁴ *Ibid.*, "Il faut Sire gagner à Dieu et à votre Majesté les peuples transmarins de l'Occident." Cf. also p. 15.

⁵ *Annales de Voyages*, Paris, 1869, I. 76-81.

⁶ *La Chasse aux Anglois en l'île de Rez et au siege de la Rochelle et la reduction de ladite ville à l'obeissance du Roy*, Paris, 1629.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Au Roy. "La revolution et conduite de ma vie m'ayant amené à estre heritier des services que les Sieurs de Valpergue ont depuis deux cens ans et au dessus rendu à vostre Majesté," etc.

spending the evening with his books as he had been formerly at the gay court of the French capital. That such a man should have left to us his impressions of a voyage to Acadia in the beginning of the seventeenth century and of his life there during some thirteen months must ever be a matter of satisfaction to those who wish to read in any detail the early history of New France.

H. P. BIGGAR.

THE TRANSITION FROM DUTCH TO ENGLISH RULE IN NEW YORK

A STUDY IN POLITICAL IMITATION

IN the development of political institutions, imitation plays a large part. What appears a successful or admirable political principle among one people, may be taken wholly or partially into the life of another race, and there under new conditions give rise to further political variations. The study of this process of imitation is always interesting, but, unfortunately, it has its dangers. No better illustration of the temptations which befall the student of political imitation could be given than the recent emphasis which has been placed upon the Dutch influence in American history. Broad and hasty generalizations have been made from analogies, in which the similarities may have been conscious or wholly accidental. *Post hoc ergo propter hoc* is the favorite argument of this class of thinkers. But if the question of the quantitative influence of Dutch upon American institutions is ever to be answered, it must be based upon something better than analogies.

Fortunately we have an opportunity to study the two races side by side, in colonial New York; and there, if anywhere, should we be able to compare the political practice of the two nations, and determine the results of the contact of one with the other. Here are seen first the Dutch ruling over subject English towns, and then the English assuming control over all New Netherland; and in their mutual relations or political expressions, now so fully illumined by the publications of the New York state government, one can find illustrations of their political activity and ideals.

An attempt has already been made¹ to compare the political practice of the Dutch and English towns under the New Amsterdam jurisdiction. In 1664 the English obtained the Dutch territories, and naturally this year, beginning the Anglicizing process, forms a logical view-point for a second glance at the Dutch and English institutions.

On March 12, 1664, King Charles II. granted to his brother James, Duke of York and Albany, a part of Maine, all of Long Island,

¹ AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, VI. 1-18, *supra*.

Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket, "and all the land from the west side of Connecticutt to the east side of Delaware Bay." By this grant the King not only disregarded the rights of the friendly nation of the Dutch, but he also ignored the charters of Massachusetts and Connecticut, and previous grants to individuals in Maine and on Long Island. No provision was made, either, for the recognition of the property rights of Englishmen or Dutchmen already settled upon the territory; and in political matters the Duke was to be absolute ruler, unrestrained by any popular participation in government:

"We do grant unto our dearest brother James, his heires deputies agents commissioners and assignes by these presents full and absolute power and authority to correct punish pardon governe and rule all such the subjects of us . . . that shall or doe at any time hereafter inhabite within the same according to such lawes orders ordinances direccons and instruments as by our said dearest brother or his assignes shall be established . . . soe alwayes as the said statutes be not contrary to but as neare as conveniently may be agreeable to the lawes statutes and government of this our realme of England . . ."

The Duke had the further right to confine the privilege of trade with his lands to such persons as he might direct. This charter, the most despotic ever granted for the government of an English colony on the American continent, harmonized well with the political theories and later practice of the Duke of York. There was no protection for the property or trade of the existing settlers; their land-titles were not secure; their religious establishments received no guarantee, and no consideration whatever was given to them in political affairs.

The arrival of an English fleet in New York harbor, and the capitulation of New Amsterdam on September 6, 1664, were the first steps in the assumption of control by the English. The actual fact of conquest was obtained through the military superiority of the English, and, as in all conquests, it took some time for the physical superiority of the conquerors to be established in legal forms; the military power was not immediately translated into civil terms. In the settlements on the Hudson and Delaware rivers several years elapsed before the ultimate governing powers were taken from the hands of the military officers and placed in the care of civil officials; and in the meanwhile, it is interesting to note the progressive limitations which were placed, voluntarily or involuntarily, upon the arbitrary actions of the Duke of York or of his officials.

Naturally the first of these checks is to be found in the terms of the capitulation of the Dutch, of which there were three sets of articles, drawn up respectively for New Amsterdam,¹ for the upper

¹ *Documents Relating to the Colonial History of New York*, II. 250-253. Quoted hereafter as *N. Y. Col. Doc.*

Hudson settlements,¹ and for the Delaware territories.² Although differing in minor details, the features of these sets of articles were closely similar. All persons recognizing the authority of the King of England were to be accepted as denizens in the English sense, and guaranteed the enjoyment of their lands, houses and goods. Permission was given to the Dutch inhabitants to leave the country within a limited time and take their property with them; if they remained in the colony, the Dutch rules of inheritance were to be maintained, and liberty of conscience and worship established. In political affairs, no sudden change in the local government was contemplated. In New Amsterdam it was agreed that

"All inferior civil officers and magistrates shall continue as now they are (if they please) till the customary time of new elections, and then new ones to be chosen by themselves, provided that such new chosen magistrates shall take the oath of allegiance to his majesty of England before they enter upon their office."

On the Delaware it was provided that

"The Present Magistrates shall be continued in their offices and Jurisdiccōns to exercise their Civill power as formerly.

"The Schoute, the Burgomasters, Sheriffe, and other inferiour Magistrates shall use and exercise their Customary Power in admⁿcon [administration] of Justice within their Precincts for Six Moneths or untill his Maj^{ties} pleasure is further known."

The conquering English thus recognized and continued the political organization, the religious principles, the property rights, and the judicial procedure of the Dutch. But this was considered only a temporary settlement, and while property rights and religious freedom might be made permanent, it was the evident intention of the English to change the political system. On Long Island there was a large English population, which had been under the Connecticut or the New Netherland jurisdiction, and which could be governed only by English methods; while New Amsterdam and the Dutch settlements on the Hudson and Delaware rivers could not easily be changed from the Dutch practices. Thus the commander Nicholls was forced to adapt his political organization to the character of the predominating race in the several sections of his lands, and yet each was influenced by the other; the establishment of English political ideas on Long Island was retarded by the Dutch principles which Nicholls had learned, and the Anglicizing process among the Dutch was hastened by the demands of the Long Island English.

¹ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 559; Biodhead, *History of the State of New York*, II 46-47.

² *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, III. 71-73; Hazard, *Annals of Pennsylvania*, 362-364.

The Dutch method of governing New Netherland harmonized well with the despotic powers given to the Duke of York. Before the conquest the Dutch Director and Council, usually resident in New Amsterdam, had been the supreme political power. They had passed the laws, they had levied and collected duties and taxes, they had formed the highest court of the colony, they had drafted and controlled the military forces, they had appointed local officials, usually from a double nomination by the incumbent officers—in short they were the absolute ruling body of New Netherland, and among them, in most cases, the director was an autocrat, whose word was law. Several partially representative boards or assemblies had, indeed, existed in New Netherland, but they had never formed an integral part of the government; and during the ten years from 1653 to 1663 there was no meeting whatever of a popular representative body. The Dutch directors thus allowed almost no popular legislative action, and with their councils they assumed all legislative, executive and judicial powers. The authorities thus exercised by the director and council closely paralleled those given to the Duke of York, and by him passed on by commission¹ to his deputy-governor, Colonel Richard Nicholls. To no other proprietor had such absolute political powers been granted, and in no other part of the continent from the Carolinas to Maine was there so little popular political liberty as was to be found in the Dutch New Netherland. Hence the new autocratic English government had the experience of the old despotic West India Company as its guide, and the policy of Governor Nicholls was made possible not only by his own military force, but also by the pre-existing political practice of the Dutch.

Following, therefore, the words of his commission, and copying also the Dutch organization, Nicholls reserved to himself and his councillors the general administration of the province. He had, indeed, promised the English inhabitants of Long Island that they should have privileges at least equal to, and perhaps greater than those of the New England colonies;² but this promise was not carried out in the sense in which it was interpreted by the Long Islanders. The governor erected Long Island, Staten Island and the Bronx peninsula into a county, called Yorkshire, and divided it into three judicial ridings; and the justices of the peace of this county were given the right to attend once a year a general judicial body, called the court of assizes. This court was composed of the

¹ Brodhead, *History of the State of New York*, Vol. II., Appendix, p. 653.

² *Southold Town Records*, I. 357; *Report of N. Y. State Historian*, 1897, 240-242; *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 555-556.

governor, his councillors and the justices; and in addition to its judicial powers, it also had the right, with the governor's consent, to pass laws. This latter feature did not, however, give to the court the nature of a popular assembly, for the justices were appointed by the governor and retained their offices during his pleasure;¹ and in some cases the governor changed the laws without waiting for the consent of the court.² Thus this body, composed of the governor's appointees, could not be truly representative of the people, when their positions were dependent upon the will of the governor.³ Finally it must be noted that the legislation of this court was not enforced throughout all the territories of the Duke, but only in Yorkshire. New Amsterdam, as we shall see, had its government prescribed for it, by Nicholls and his council; while, for ten years or more, the settlements on the Delaware and the upper Hudson rivers were governed solely by the instructions sent to the military commanders at those places.

With the continuance of the English authority, and the influx of English office-holders, traders and settlers, the process of Anglicization advanced, gradually introducing one or another of the features of English political practice, but maintaining, too, part of the Dutch customs untouched. In New Amsterdam the government was changed from that of Dutch "burgomasters and schepens" to English "mayor and aldermen and sheriff;" on Long Island a code of laws, "the Duke's Laws," was drawn up by Nicholls, establishing many English customs in Yorkshire; on the Delaware and Hudson rivers some English features were introduced; and at last, after almost twenty years had passed, and much popular opposition to the Duke's government had arisen, the noble proprietor granted his colonists the privilege of electing delegates to a representative assembly. The subject thus naturally falls under two heads, the first dealing with the changes in local government, and the second with the adaptation of the English idea of political representation to the territories of the Duke of York. The present paper will discuss the first topic only, and attempt to point out the local governmental policy.⁴

As New Amsterdam, now called New York, was the seat of government of the province, and the city officials were nearest of all

¹ *N. Y. Colonial Laws*, I. 55.

² *Ibid.*, 70, 88.

³ Yet the Duke of York maintained that the court was a satisfactory representative body. *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, III. 218.

⁴ No mention will be made of the institutions developing in the tract of land between the Hudson and Delaware rivers—New Jersey—because under the government of its proprietors it was almost independent of New York.

local officers to the person of the governor, it will be best to glance first at the conditions therein. The articles of capitulation, already quoted, confirmed the civil magistrates in their positions, and granted them the right of making new elections at the close of their terms. There was, therefore, no compulsory change in the personnel of the city government, but several changes took place voluntarily on the part of the incumbents; one of the city magistrates left for Europe,¹ another resigned his position,² and the schout of the neighboring hamlet of Harlem refused to perform the duties of his office.³ No advantage appears to have been taken by Nicholls of these opportunities to place Englishmen in office; but the vacancies were filled, if at all, in the old Dutch manner. In the meantime the local officers, schout, burgomasters and schepens, continued to hold their courts, appoint arbitrators, and adopt local measures; and no change appears in their manner of holding meetings or in the extent of their jurisdiction. In February, 1665, the terms of the officers expired, and in their customary way, they presented in nomination to the governor the names of persons to fill the offices for the ensuing year; whom he, following the habit of the Dutch directors, confirmed.⁴ Thus there appears no formal change in the government of the city.

Yet Nicholls was making his influence felt. In October, 1664, he had required both city magistrates and inhabitants to take an oath to obey all commands issued by the King of England, by the Duke of York, or by any of his governors or officers.⁵ And early in the next spring he ordered the city to find quarters for one hundred soldiers; but the burghers refused to take them into their houses, and after a long controversy, the city authorities yielded so far that they ordered a tax for the support of the soldiers.⁶

Perhaps as a result of this quarrel over the quartering of soldiers, or it may be as the outcome of a policy already adopted by Nicholls, in June 1665 the old Dutch forms were superseded by the titles of an English corporation, and the Dutch officers were set aside to make room for Englishmen. On June 12, Nicholls appeared in the

¹ *Records of New Amsterdam*, V. 160.

² *Ibid.*, 166.

³ Riker, *History of Harlem*, 239-240.

⁴ *Records of New Amsterdam*, V. 183-184. The new officers were all Dutchmen.

⁵ *Records of New Amsterdam*, V. 142 ff.; *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, III. 74-77. The oath is as follows: "I swear by the name of Almighty God, that I will be a true subject, to the King of Great Brittain, and will obey all such commands, as I shall receive from His Majestie, His Royall Highnesse James Duke of Yorke, and such Governors and Officers, as from time to time are appointed over me, by His authority, and none other, whilst I live in any of his Majties territories; So helpe me God."

⁶ *Records of New Amsterdam*, V. 208-220.

Dutch city court with several papers which outlined the form and named the persons of the new government.¹ By these documents, the governor abolished the offices of schout, burgomaster and schepen, and in place thereof established a corporation governed by a mayor, five aldermen and a sheriff, "according to the custome of England in other his Ma^{ties} Corporacons." Of these seven new officers, the mayor, Thomas Willett, and two of the aldermen were English, while the others were Dutch. Nicholls further extended this new municipal government throughout all Manhattan Island, and gave the new corporation

" . . . full power and authoritye to Rule and Governe as well all the Inhabitants of this Corporacon, as any Strangers, according to the Generall Lawes of this Governm^t and such peculiar Lawes as are, or shall be thought convenient and necessary for the good and Welfare of this his Ma^{ties} Corporacon ; as also to appoint such under officers, as they shall judge necessary for the orderly execution of Justice. . . "

Two days later Nicholls again entered the Dutch municipal court, this time accompanied, as the records say, by " his Hon^r M^r Thomas Willet " and the new officers. One courageous burgomaster objected to the change as contrary to the promise made in the articles of capitulation, but Nicholls speciously argued that he had granted all that the articles provided ; for had he not allowed a new election when the terms of the old officers expired in February last ? This was all he had promised.²

The new officers entered upon their duties on June 15, 1665 : on which day they elected a city constable, made provision for the fencing of the church-yard where hogs had been rooting, and continued in office the Dutch secretary and town sergeants.³ The real changes made by these innovations were more nominal and personal than administrative ; in place of the Dutch titles and persons, Englishmen and English corporation titles were substituted ; but there was little change in the duties of the officers. The English officers passed local ordinances as the Dutch had done ; they elected minor officials, and particularly they established an interesting system of selection from double nominations made by the people of Harlem and the neighboring " farmers ; " ⁴ they held the municipal courts, tried cases and appointed arbitrators. In all these matters they followed the Dutch precedents, in some cases even extending the Dutch

¹ *Documentary History of New York*, I. 602-604 ; *Records of New Amsterdam*, V. 248-251.

² See *ante*, p. 695.

³ *Records of New Amsterdam*, V. 252.

⁴ *Ibid.*, V. 345 ; VI. 4, 15, 92, 150, 184, 207, 296, 361, 374.

methods to new subjects, as when the purely Dutch double-nomination principle was extended to fire-wardens, overseers of highways, militia officers, and even the public draymen.¹ The incumbents of all these offices were given the power, in accordance with the Dutch custom, of nominating a double number of candidates to fill their positions for the ensuing year; and the "election," as it was called, was made by the city authorities from the names thus submitted to them. But while accepting the Dutch practice in many things, the municipal court made one decided change toward English ideas. The old Dutch courts had determined cases either directly by the magistrates themselves, or indirectly by the appointment of arbitrators;² but now within a fortnight of the change in government, the new court established the jury system by the appointment of twelve jurors, who determined both civil and criminal matters.³ Thus, although the jurors were chosen by the court, the grand old English custom of a trial by one's peers was confirmed to the inhabitants of the city.

In the new English municipal government, the only popular feature was this introduction of juries into the courts; and beyond this, the English governor exercised more power over the appointment of the city officers than did the Dutch director. The latter had allowed the existing officers to nominate to him a double number of candidates, but Nicholls did not even allow this liberty; for, when the one year's term of his first appointees had expired, new ones were placed in office without any nominations by people or magistrates.⁴ This continued for three years, until, in 1669, the mayor and aldermen asked the new governor, Lovelace, to select the new officers from a double nomination made by themselves.⁵ This modicum of political privileges was granted by the governor, and until the Dutch reoccupation the governor selected the city officials from such double nominations.⁶ Under the English, therefore, as under the Dutch, there was no popular participation in the city government; and the magistrates appointed inferior officers, passed by-laws, tried petty cases, and admitted freemen.⁷ It was

¹ See references given in preceding note.

² The arbitrators were frequently chosen from among those who had held the office of schepen.

³ *Records of New Amsterdam*, V. 267, 279, etc. This jury system was discontinued by the Dutch during their reoccupation of New York in 1673-1674; but was again put in force by the English after their restoration; *Records of New Amsterdam*, VII. *passim*; *Report of State Historian*, 1897, 286-288.

⁴ *Records of New Amsterdam*, VI. 18.

⁵ *Ibid.*, VI. 88, 144, 200, 201.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 260, 332, 384.

⁷ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, III. 337; *Penna. Archives*, second series, V. 689.

a combination of the worst type of English municipal corporation with the somewhat redeeming feature of the Dutch double-nomination system; it refused all popular suffrage, as did some of the English city corporations of the day; but the annual change of officers was at least an advance over the close corporations and life-tenure of these municipalities.

The city further retained the trade privileges and monopolies which had been granted to it in the Dutch days. No one could exercise any trade in the city or sell goods at retail unless he were a freeman of the city; only such freemen who had actually resided in the city for three years could trade up the Hudson River; no inhabitants dwelling up the river could trade abroad; no flour or biscuit for export could be manufactured outside of the city; and the city was the *staple* of the whole province, at which "all merchandize was Shipped and unloaden."¹

This form of government continued without material change, except for the fifteen months' occupation of the Dutch,² until the year 1683. In that year, the city officers petitioned the governor for a more democratic government. It was an opportune time for such a demand. Much popular opposition had been aroused to the Duke's rule and to the taxes laid by his officers; and on Long Island, riots, insubordination, and threats of secession from the Duke's government voiced the feeling of the people. Dongan, a newly arrived governor, had, according to his instructions, granted the people a representative assembly; and this assembly, in a charter of liberties, had attempted to give permanent form to the republican system.³ And now, but a few days after the assembly had passed this so-called charter, the city authorities asked for popular representation in their local government. The petition prayed that certain officers should be elected by the freemen of the city, and others appointed by the governor. The city was to be divided into six wards, in which the freemen were to elect yearly their own officers: aldermen, common councilmen, constable, overseers of the poor, assessors, scavengers, questmen, and "other officers usefull and necessary for the said Corporation and Ward."⁴ They asked that the mayor be appointed annually by the governor from among the six aldermen; that the recorder, sheriff, coroner and town clerk

¹ *Ibid.*

² It has not been thought necessary to discuss the period of Dutch occupation, from August, 1673, to November, 1674. The Dutch municipal titles were again adopted; Dutchmen were placed in office; but no great change in municipal functions occurred, and no change was made in the relations of city and governor.

³ *N. Y. Col. Laws*, I. 111-116.

⁴ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, III. 338-339.

be appointed by the governor, and that a treasurer be appointed by the corporation officers.

Dongan, through fear or favor, granted most of these demands, and in October 1684 the first election under the new plan was held ; the six wards each electing one alderman and one common councilman and the governor selecting the mayor from a list of seven names which had been submitted to him.¹ But these privileges were not formally granted in a charter, and hence the mayor, in writing, in 1685, to King James in congratulation upon his accession and giving wishes for a prosperous reign, closes his letter with the hope that the Jerseys will be re-united with New York, and that the King will "Grant to this his Citty such privileges and Immunitys as may again make it flourish and encrease his Ma^{ty's} revenue."²

At last, by the charter of April 27, 1686, the desire of the city was granted.³ The form of government already instituted by Dongan was changed but little. The elective officers were the aldermen, assistants and petty constables. The mayor and sheriff were appointed annually by the governor ; the recorder, town clerk and clerk of the market were appointed during the will of the governor ; the high constable was appointed by the mayor, and the chamberlain was chosen yearly by the mayor, aldermen and assistants. The elective officers were to be "chosen by Majority of Voices of the Inhabitants of each Ward ;" a most vague provision which later needed legislative interpretation.⁴ The charter also confirmed to the city some of the old trade privileges, and the titles to certain lands, docks and ferries.

Dongan's charter was more democratic in appearance than in practice. Through his appointing power the governor had control of the more important city officials, and the ordinance power of the corporation was limited by the fact that its ordinances were to remain in force only for three months, unless confirmed by the governor and council. Thus the city officers, in writing to King James, in 1687, could well say, "The Govern^t of the whole Citty is altogether lodged in Yo^r Ma^{ty} and Gov^r, The Mayor, Recorder, Sherif, Town Clerk appointed by Yo^r Ma^{ty} or Governor, the rest are only

¹ Brodhead, II. 408.

² *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, III. 361.

³ *N. Y. Col. Laws*, I. 181-195.

⁴ The act of May 1, 1702 (*Col. Laws*, I. 490), defined more precisely the qualifications of the suffrage, but it was disapproved by the Queen. The Montgomery charter cleared up the ambiguity (*Col. Laws*, II. 575-639). But other difficulties arose and additional legislation was passed in 1771 (*Col. Laws*, V. 228), and 1774 (*Laws of N. Y.*, 1774-1775, p. 45).

servil Officers appointed by the people.”¹ This charter remained in force, without substantial change, until the American Revolution, Montgomery's charter of 1730 making but slight alterations in the city government.

By the year 1686, therefore, the process of formally Anglicizing the municipal government was completed. The English municipal corporation of the seventeenth century, having some elective and some appointive officers, was made the model for the new-world city; and twenty-two years after the English conquest of New Netherland, New York City became, in outward political appearance at least, an English corporation. There still remained the Dutch blood, the Dutch customs, traditions and speech; but from the point of view of formal political organization, New York was now an English city.

Before the English conquest, political conditions on Long Island had been varied. There were three distinct groups of settlements, each developing political habits different from the others. The greater part of the island, extending from Oyster Bay eastward, had, since the treaty of 1650 between the English and the Dutch, been under the control of New Haven or Connecticut; and some of the towns had sent deputies to the General Court at Hartford. The laws and customs of New Haven or Connecticut were established in these towns, and politically, as well as geographically, they formed a part of New England. To the westward of Oyster Bay, and stretching in an irregular strip across the island, were the five English towns under the Dutch jurisdiction. These English settlements had been granted lands and charters of incorporation by Dutch directors, which gave them greater privileges than those enjoyed by the Dutch under the New Netherland government;² but did not leave them so free in local matters as were the Connecticut towns. In the tumultuous years, 1663-1664, these towns had thrown off the authority of the Dutch, and had elected for themselves a President, one John Scott; and claimed to be independent both of New Netherland and of New England.³ Finally, in the extreme western part of the island were the five Dutch settlements,⁴ whose governments were modelled closely after the town-corporation system of Holland.

But a few weeks after the conquest, Nicholls, in the letter already quoted, had promised the English inhabitants of Long

¹ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, III. 425.

² Stuyvesant says, “The Englishmen enjoy more privileges than the Exemptions of New Netherland grant to any Hollander.” *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 233.

³ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 542, 544, 547-548, 551-552.

⁴ The five English towns were Newtown, Hempstead, Flushing, Gravesend and Jamaica; the five Dutch towns were Breucklen, Midwout, Amersfoort, New Utrecht and Bushwick.

Island certain political privileges. Naturally the Englishmen who had enjoyed self-government under Connecticut or New Netherland wished to have their rights confirmed by the new English authorities; and, on the other hand, Nicholls was most likely to take up, first of all, the establishment of proper political forms among his fellow-Englishmen. Hence it is not surprising that the first code of laws was limited to the county of Yorkshire, that is, to Long Island, the Bronx peninsula, and Staten Island.

In accordance with his earlier promise, therefore, Nicholls in February of 1665 wrote to the inhabitants of Long Island, reciting the past wrongs under which they had groaned, the "signall grace and honor" which the King had shown in reducing the neighboring foreign power, and his own determination, in discharge of his trust and duty, to call a general meeting at Hempstead, on the last day of February, 1665. The governor ordered that the assembly should consist of "Deputyes chosen by the major part of the freemen only, which is to be understood, of all Persons rated according to their Estates, whether English, or Dutch;" and recommended to the people that in the choice of their deputies they select "the most sober, able and discreet persons without partiality or faction, the fruit and benefitt whereof will return to themselves in a full and perfect settlement and composure of all controversyes, and the propagacon of true Religion amongst us."¹

The directions of this letter were followed out, and on February 28, 1665, thirty-four deputies, from seventeen towns, assembled at Hempstead. With the exception of two delegates from Westchester, all the deputies represented Long Island towns, both Dutch and English towns sending delegates.² On the day following their meeting, the deputies acknowledged themselves to be within the limits of the patent of the Duke of York, and unanimously declared their submission to all laws which should be made by the Duke's authority.³ This declaration bound them to observe the code of laws upon which Nicholls had been at work, and which now he promulgated in their presence. This code, known as the "Duke's Laws," following the example of the New England codes, was arranged alphabetically according to subject-matter; and its provisions were drawn in very large measure from the laws of Massachusetts and New Haven, copies of which Nicholls had obtained.⁴ And yet, while he took some of the New England laws bodily, Nicholls' code shows some very significant changes and omissions;

¹ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 564.

² *Ibid.*, 565.

³ *Ibid.*, III. 91.

⁴ *N. Y. Col. Laws*, I. 7; Brodhead, II. 66.

alterations, indeed, which changed the essential features of the New England democratic system; and changed materially the government of the English towns on Long Island, at the same time that they gave new laws to the Dutch towns.¹

If the Laws be grouped together according to subject-matter instead of the alphabetical arrangement, they will be found to contain a civil and criminal code, elaborate provisions concerning local government, and a general provincial organization of the courts and the militia. In all of these features there are numerous changes from the New England customs; and in order to appreciate the force of the Dutch influence and of the political ideas of Nicholls, a short comparison of the three codes will be made. The changes which Nicholls introduced fall into three classes; first, the omission of New England features; second, the introduction of Dutch customs; and third, the insertion of wholly new provisions.

Turning our attention to the New England features which were omitted from the Duke's Laws, the most noticeable one is the absence of any general provincial legislative assembly, in which the people are represented. Nicholls had promised privileges to the people at least as great as those of the New England colonies; but now, although the towns demanded that taxation and representation should be united,² Nicholls made no provision whatever for an assembly. As the Laws are altogether silent upon the subject of general legislation, that power remained vested in the Duke's governor and his council, almost as fully as it had previously resided in the West India Company's director and council.³ The governor chose, indeed, to associate with himself in legislation the members of the court of assizes, but this did not answer the popular appeal for an

¹ The comparison which follows is based upon the New Haven printed code of 1656, the Massachusetts printed code of 1660, and the two copies of the Duke's Laws, known as the Easthampton and Roslyn copies. New Haven's laws were published in London, 1656, entitled, *New-Haven's Settling in New-England. And some Lawes for Government: Published for the Use of that Colony*; and have been reprinted in *New Haven Colonial Records, 1653-1665*, p. 571 ff. The Massachusetts code, printed at Cambridge, 1660, is entitled, *The Book of the General Lawes and Libertyes Concerning the Inhabitants of the Massachusetts*. . . . The best edition of the Duke's Laws is that in Volume I. of the *Colonial Laws of New York*, which gives the Easthampton and Roslyn variations; they may also be found in *New York Historical Society Collections*, I. 307, and in *Laws of the Province of Pennsylvania*, 1682-1700.

² Instructions to Southold deputies to the Hempstead meeting, given February 22, 1664. They are directed to ask "That there be not any Ratte, Levy or Charge, or money raised but what shall be with the consent of the major part of the deputies in a General Court or mettinge." *Southold Town Records*, I. 358-359.

³ See the demand of the town of Easthampton for an assembly, and the efforts to obtain concerted action on the part of the eastern towns of Long Island, *Easthampton Town Records*, I. 241.

assembly,¹ and reproduced very inadequately the strong representative system of England and New England.

In local legislation, a change was made which corresponded to the omission of the general assembly in provincial affairs. The Laws abolish the town-meeting as a part of the local administrative system, and in its place put an elective constable and board of overseers;² who are given the power to pass local ordinances, enforce them and try cases arising under them. The provision of the Massachusetts code permitting towns to elect selectmen and thus relieving the town meeting of minor matters, is made compulsory in the Duke's Laws, and the constable and overseers are invested with the local administrative powers which the whole community exercised in New England. It is interesting to note with what a slight alteration in phraseology the change from the pure democracy to the representative system is made. The text of the three codes is as follows :

Duke's Laws. *Massachusetts, 1660.* *New Haven, 1656.*

<p>"Whereas in particular Townes many things do arise, which concerne onely themselves, and the well Ordering their Affairs, as the disposing, Planting, Building and the like, of their owne Lands and woods, granting of Lotts, Election of Officers, Assessing of Rates with many other matters of a prudentiall Nature, tending to the Peace and good Government of the Respective Townes the Constable by and with the Consent of five at least,</p>	<p>"Whereas Particular Townes have many things which concerne onely themselves, and the Ordering their own affaires, and disposing of business in their own Town. It is therefore Ordered, that the free-men of every town, with such others as are allowed, or the Major part of them, shall have power to dispose of their own Lands and woods, with all the Priviledges and appurtenances of the said Townes, to grant Lots, and also to chuse their</p>	<p>"Whereas the Free-men of every Town, or plantation, within this Jurisdiction, have in sundry particulars liberty to make Orders among themselves, as about Fencing their Land, ordering or keeping their Cattel, or Swine, &c. as may best suite with their own conveniency; It is by this Court Ordered, That if any cattel," etc. <i>New Haven Colonial Records, 1653-1665, p. 604.</i></p>
---	---	--

¹ In some cases Nicholls promulgated changes in the laws, and afterwards had these alterations ratified by the Court of Assizes; *Report of State Historian of N. Y.*, 1896, p. 303. In 1675, after the Court of Assizes had been fully organized, it was attended by the governor, three councillors, three aldermen of New York City, four justices from each of the three ridings of Yorkshire, two from Albany, one from Schenectady, two from Esopus, and the sheriff from the Delaware; making twenty-five in all. *Report of State Historian of N. Y.*, 1897, 387 ff.

² The term "town-meeting" occurs four times in the laws, but in each case it means the meeting of the constable and overseers, and not a meeting of the towns-people. In two of these cases, the court of assizes took pains to change the term to town-courts. *N. Y. Col. Laws*, I. 80, 82. See also *Memorial History of the City of New York*, I. 316, 328.

of the Overseers for the time being, have power to Ordaine such or so many peculier Constitutions as are Necessary to the welfare and Improvement of their Towne; Provided they bee not of a Criminall Nature, And that the Penalties Exceed not Twenty Shillings for one Offence, and that they be not Repugnant to the publique Lawes; And if any Inhabitant shall neglect or refuse to observe them The Constable and Overseers shall have power to Levie such fines by distress." *N. Y. Col. Laws*, I. 63.

own Particular Officers, as Constables, Serveyors for the High-wayes, and the like annually or otherwise as need Requires; And to make such Lawes and Constitutions as may Concerne the Welfare of their Town. Provided they be not of a Criminall, but of a prudentiall Nature, and that their penalties exceed not twenty shillings for one Offence, and that they be not Repugnant to the publick Lawes and Orders of the Country. . . .

"2. And every Township hath power to chuse yearly or for less time, a convenient number of fit men to order the planting and prudential affairs of their Townes according to instruction given to them in Writing, provided nothing be done by them, contrary to the Laws and orders of the Country. . . ."

Book of General Laws, 1660, p. 75.

Comparing Nicholls's code with the Massachusetts laws, the governor appears desirous to keep as many *words* of the original as possible, while in fact he was changing vitally the real principle of the New England town system.

One of the strongest features of the New England political systems was the matter of freemanship, which had been introduced into their practice by the corporate nature of their local and provincial governments. This fiction of freemanship, copied from the customs of English municipal and trading corporations, received a far wider application in the colonies than had been dreamed of in England. Through it the political and religious oligarchy of Massachusetts had been maintained; by it objectionable persons had been excluded from local and provincial affairs in Connecticut; and

in New Haven it was the mainstay of the theocracy. The exclusive nature of the freemanship in Massachusetts had led to a long contest with King Charles II. ; and Nicholls, whom we see in New York legislating for the Duke of York's province, was also associated by the King with three other commissioners to investigate the general conditions of the New England colonies and institute needed reforms. One of the principal subjects assigned to these commissioners was the extension of the suffrage and the abolition of exclusive freemanship.¹

Nicholls's instructions from the King and his personal knowledge of the principle respecting freemen in New England must have influenced him when framing his legislation ; for, although the term freeman occurs scores of times in the New England laws,² it is most sedulously erased from the Duke's Laws ; and even the allied subjects of residence and admission of inhabitants are omitted from the New York code. The Massachusetts and New Haven laws forbade a man's taking up residence in a town without the consent of the local officers or the town-meeting ; but this method of admission was in principle akin to the New England principle respecting freemen, and it, too, was ignored by Nicholls. In addition to fostering political and ecclesiastical intolerance, the New England freemanship, whether of province or town, was opposed to the powers granted by charter to the Duke of York.³ Finally, Nicholls had the New Netherland custom on his side, for Stuyvesant, five years before this, had said that the admission of new inhabitants was not a subject for local determination, but belonged to the central authority.⁴ Thus there appear ample reasons for the absence of the subject of freemanship ; Nicholls's own experience in New England, the royal instructions, the Duke's charter and Dutch custom were all opposed to the exclusiveness of the New England corporations ; and in this feature, as in some others, the innovations of the New York governor were steps toward greater freedom.

¹ See *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, III. 51-54, 57-63, 84, 110-113 ; *Records of Massachusetts*, IV. pt. II., pp. 129, 173-174, 186 ff., 200-211, 218 ff.

² The word *freeman* does occur once in the Laws, but in that case it has the meaning of *free man*, *N. Y. Col. Laws*, I. 36. The words *freeman* and *freemen* are used twenty-five times in the New Haven laws, and fifty-five times in the Massachusetts code.

³ By the Duke's charter he and his heirs are given power "to admit such and so many person and persons to trade and traffique unto and within the terrytoryes and islands aforesaid and into every and any part and parcell thereof and to have possesse and enjoy any lands or hereditaments in the parts and places aforesaid. . . ."

⁴ "None of the Townes of N. Netherlands are troubled with Inhabitanace, the which doe not Lyke her or her Magistrates, beinge reserved that they doe not admitt any Inhabitanace without approbation and acknowledgement of the Director Generall and Counsell . . . " *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 211.

New England narrowness was avoided also in the treatment of the whole question of religion. The Duke's code imposed no religious qualifications upon voters or office-holders; and it omitted altogether the title "Heresy" which occupied such a prominent place in the New England laws. Instead of the religious uniformity to which the Puritans aspired, the new laws provided for religious toleration: "Nor shall any person be molested, fined or Imprisoned for differing in Judgment in matters of Religion who professes Christianity." Nicholls also pruned out of his models practically all the Puritanic and Sabbatarian legislation which they contained, and at the same time retained the popular election of ministers and the compulsory payment of tithes for church support.¹

If Nicholls advanced individual liberty by rejecting the religious system and the freeman-principle of New England, the same cannot be said of another omission. It would have been well for the colony if the governor could have introduced the educational system of New England; and yet, perhaps, this was impossible. Economic and racial differences existing in New York would have interfered with the successful establishment of schools and colleges. The solidarity of New England society found no parallel in New York. In place thereof, we see various nationalities, many sects, and feudal ranks, all tending to mark off society into distinct classes. In such a population, an immediate erection of a public school system similar to that of Massachusetts was impracticable.²

As the following extracts show, Nicholl's provision for education was in most vague terms, omitting the subject of schools, and not even mentioning instruction in reading. For unruly conduct on the part of the child or servant, the Duke's Laws punished the child, while New Haven and Massachusetts held the master or parent responsible and punished him for the waywardness of his child or servant:

¹ The diversity of sects in New York, and the toleration which followed from that diversity, were not unmixed blessings from the spiritual point of view, as the following quotation shows:

"Every Town ought to have a Minister. New York has first a Chaplain belonging to the Fort of the Church of England; secondly a Dutch Calvinist; thirdly a French Calvinist; fourthly a Dutch Lutheran. . . . Here be not many of the Church of England; few Roman Catholicks; abundance of Quakers preachers men and Women especially; Singing Quakers; Ranting Quakers; Sabbatarians; Antisabbatarians; Some Anabaptists some Independants; some Jews; in short of all sorts of opinions there are some, and the most part of none at all." Governor Dongan's description in 1686, *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, III. 415.

² The Massachusetts code discusses the subject of education under three heads, "Children and Youth," "College," and "Schools," giving to these titles three pages out of a total of eighty-three. The New Haven code treats of education under the title "Children's Education," taking one page out of a total of fifty; while the Duke's Laws give the matter only one-third of a page in a code comprising sixty-four pages.

Duke's Laws.

"The Constable and Overseers are strictly required frequently to Admonish the Inhabitants of Instructing their Children and Servants in matters of Religion, and the Lawes of the Country, And that the Parents and Masters do bring up their Children and Apprentices in some honest Lawfull Calling Labour or Employment. And if any Children or Servants become rude Stubborne or unruly refusing to hearken to the voice of their Parents or Masters the Constable and Overseers, (where no Justice of Peace shall happen to dwell within ten miles of the said Town or Parish) have power upon the Complaint of their Parents or Masters to call before them Such an Offender, and to Inflict such Corporall punishment as the meritt of their fact in their Judgment shall deserve, not exceeding ten Stripes, provided that such Children and Servants be of Sixteen years of age."

N. Y. Col. Laws, I. 26.

Massachusetts, 1660.

"Forasmuch as the good education of children is of singular behoofe and benefit to any Common-wealth, and whereas many parents and masters are too indulgent and negligent of their duty in that kind. It is ordered that the Select men of every Town in the several precincts, and quarters where they dwell, shall have a vigilant eye over their brethren and neighbours, to see, first that none of them shall suffer so much barbarism in any of their families, as not to endeavour to teach, by themselves or others, their children and apprentices, so much learning as may enable them perfectly to read the english tongue, and knowledge of the Capital laws: upon penaltie of twenty shillings for each neglect therein. Also that all masters of families, do once a week (at the least) catechise their children and servants in the grounds and principles of Religion, and if any be unable to do so much; that then at the least they procure such children and apprentices, to learn some short orthodox catechism without book, that they may be able to answer unto the questions, that shall be propounded to them, out of such catechism by their parents or masters or any of the Select

New Haven, 1656.

"Whereas too many Parents and Masters, either through an overtender respect to their own occasions, and businesse, or not duly considering the good of their Children, and apprentices, have too much neglected duty in their Education, while they are young, and capable of learning, It is ordered that . . . all parents and Masters, doe duly endeavour, either by their own ability and labour, or by improving such Schoolmaster, or other helps and means, as the Plantation doth afford, or the family may conveniently provide, that all their children, and Apprentices as they grow capable, may through Gods blessing, attain at least so much, as to be able duly to read the Scriptures, and other good and profitable Books in the English tongue, being their native language, and in some competent measure, to understand the main grounds and principles of Christian Religion necessary to salvation. And to give a due Answer to such plain and ordinary Questions, as may . . . be propounded concerning the same . . ."

[If the law be not observed by any parent or master, after three months' warning, a fine of ten shillings to be levied upon him; a

men, when they shall double fine if no im-
call them to a tryall, of provement in three
what they have learned months; and at the end
in this kind. And fur- of the third term of
ther that all parents three months, an in-
and masters do breed creased fine may be
and bring up their chil- levied or the child
dren and apprentices in taken away from the
some honest Lawfull parent or master.]
calling, labour, or im- *New Haven Colonial*
ployment, either in hus- *Records*, 1653-1665, p.
bandry or some other 583.
trade, profitable for
themselves and the
Common-wealth, if they
will not or cannot train
them up in learning to
fitt them for higher im-
ployments. . . .

[If parents and mas-
ters refuse to obey this
law and to train up
their children and ser-
vants properly, the chil-
dren and servants may
be taken away and given
to those who will more
strictly enforce this law.]

Book of General Laws,
1660, p. 136.

Passing by many minor omissions, we may, in the second place, look at the Dutch customs which were introduced by Nicholls into his code. The most patent feature which the governor was forced to adopt was the Dutch religious toleration. In his instructions,¹ he had been cautioned to respect colonial religion, and in the articles of capitulation at the surrender of New Amsterdam, Nicholls had promised the Dutchmen liberty of worship and church discipline.² Naturally the Duke's Laws, framed as they were for Dutch and English towns on Long Island, took the only practicable position by accepting Dutch toleration and Dutch religious indifference. Uniformity was impracticable in a population made up of Dutch Calvinists, Dutch Lutherans, English Puritans, Baptists and Quakers and many minor sects. Compulsory church attendance was impossible where churches did not exist, and the people were unaccustomed to regular public worship.³ And strict Sabbath observ-

¹ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, III. 51-61.

² *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, II. 250-253.

³ *N. Y. Col. Laws*, I. 24.

ance could not be had where Puritan asceticism and Calvinist literalism were lacking. We have already seen that the Puritanic legislation of New England was set aside by Nicholls. A single sentence expressed his care for the Sabbath: "Sundays are not to be prophaned by Travellers Labourers or vicious Persons." The Duke's Laws, indeed, had some positive provisions concerning religion, such as for the erection of a church accommodating two hundred persons in each parish, the induction of ministers into office by the governor, and the collection of tithes. But the essential change made by Nicholls was the legalization of all *Protestant* sects and the substitution of such toleration for the compulsory religious uniformity of the Puritan codes.

Another Dutch custom introduced by Nicholls was the practice of plural nomination and partial retirement in public offices. This was a matter much more peculiarly Dutch than was religious toleration, and much less strongly demanded by local conditions; and yet it was applied by the new governor in a number of instances. It has already been noted that Nicholls was ready to adopt this system in New York City,¹ and his liking for it is shown also in the Duke's Laws.

The system of partial retirement, unused in New England, had been customary in New Netherland, although the method was by no means a rigid one.² The Duke's Laws provided for eight overseers (= selectmen) in each town, four of whom should retire each year. From among the retiring four overseers, there should be chosen annually one to hold the office of constable during the ensuing year. This again savored of the Dutch custom, for the towns, both of old and New Netherland, were accustomed to call upon the "old magistrates," as they were named, for advice and assistance to the new. The plan of Nicholls was an improvement upon this system, for it gave to the voters the right of choosing the best one of the four experienced retiring overseers to serve them in the most important town office. Dutch influence was seen also in the manner in which the two churchwardens in each parish were selected by the constable and eight overseers from their own number.³ It is noticeable again in the selection of jurors from among

¹ See *ante*, p. 700.

² See *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 314, 344, 412, 473, etc. The Dutch principle is well expressed in the following words: "It is customary in our Fatherland and other well-regulated governments, that annually some change take place in the magistracy, so that some new ones are appointed, and some are continued to inform the newly appointed." *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 196.

³ This was soon changed, however, and church affairs placed in the hands of the whole board of constable and overseers, *N. Y. Col. Laws*, I. 78. This method of choosing churchwardens is similar to that of Virginia, where the vestrymen chose the churchwardens from their own number.

the overseers of the towns, for the Dutch custom had often called upon the existing town magistrates or the former magistrates to assist in the administration of justice, although a regular jury system was not established. More particularly, the determination of petty civil cases by arbitrators, which was a prominent part of the Dutch judicial system,¹ was now incorporated by Nicholls into his new code.²

In the selection of sheriff, the Dutch system of plural nomination is also seen, but the method comes nearer to that adopted four years earlier in Maryland,³ and later established in Virginia.⁴ The High Sheriff for Yorkshire, holding office for one year, was to be chosen in rotation from each of the three ridings of the county. The court of sessions of the riding whose turn it was to select the sheriff, presented three names to the governor; and from this triple nomination the governor chose the incumbent for the ensuing year.⁵ This method of election of sheriff, although abolished at an early date in New York, persisted in other parts of the original territory of the Duke of York for one hundred and seventy years, and the principle of plural nominations was transplanted into the territorial policy of the United States.⁶

The town board of the constable and eight overseers was organized after both the New England and the New Netherland practice. Its legislative activity corresponded, in large measure, to the ordinance-power of the New England selectmen; but with one marked difference, which brought the board closer to the Dutch custom. The New England selectmen possessed only such powers in legislation as were delegated to them by the town-meetings, while the Dutch local courts, on the other hand, had possessed local ordinance power aside from the Director and his Council. In this respect, Nicholls copied the Dutch practice; and followed it even further, in making the constable and overseers a judicial body as well. Thus the elective feature of the local boards of the Duke's Laws was English; the extent of their powers was Dutch.

¹ See *Records of New Amsterdam*, *passim*.

² *N. Y. Col. Laws*, I. 7, 32, 63. Compare arbitrators in Providence, *Rhode Island Colonial Records*, I. 27-31.

³ *Archives of Maryland*, Proceedings of Assembly, 1637-1664, pp. 412, 451 (1661 and 1662).

⁴ Hening, *Statutes*, III. 246 (1705); V. 515 (1748).

⁵ *N. Y. Col. Laws*, I. 63.

⁶ See the charter granted by Penn in 1701 to Pennsylvania and the Delaware territories; Pennsylvania constitutions of 1776 and 1790 (in force till 1837); Delaware constitutions of 1776 and 1792 (in force till 1831); Northwest Ordinance of 1787, in the appointment of the council; and the same feature by implication in territorial acts of Indiana, 1800; Mississippi, 1800; Michigan, 1805; and Illinois, 1809.

The parallelism of the Duke's constable and overseers to the Dutch local court is still more noticeable when it is remembered that the ordinances of the town boards under the Laws must be sanctioned by the court of sessions, and that under the Dutch, local by-laws must be approved by the director and council at New Amsterdam. An inspection of some of the town-records shows, in certain cases, a carrying out of the provisions of the Laws, and a total cessation of administrative activity on the part of the town-meetings after the Duke's Laws were promulgated;¹ in other cases, the local board and the town-meeting exercised this power jointly;² and in still other cases, the towns almost ignored Nicholls's efforts to shift power from the town-meetings to the constable and overseers.³ In general, it may be said, that the governor failed in his attempt to crush the town-meetings; and although the towns for a time gave up a part of their activity, they soon, in the struggle for popular representation, regained their old powers, and the town-meeting became as important a factor in the attainment of representative principles during the years from 1668 to 1683, as it was in the similar, though broader, struggle just one hundred years later.

The third class of changes instituted by Nicholls in the New England codes which he had before him, included those of a nature foreign to both the Dutch and New England legislation. In some cases they were taken from the precedents of old England, and in others they were entirely new. Among the more important of the latter features was the compulsory renewal of all former land and town grants, and the surrender of the old deeds and patents. This law not only invalidated all old grants, but as it required new surveys and the payment of fees for the new patents, it became a fruitful source of popular agitation and discontent. Of the English features introduced, the most marked are to be seen in the judicial organization. The English life-holding justices of the peace were appointed; the judicial "ridings," the courts of sessions and of assizes, the high sheriffs and the under-sheriffs, all call up similar English institutions.

¹ See *Easthampton* (Vol. I.) and *Southampton* (Vols. I. and II.) *Town Records*; before 1665 legislative activity of town-meeting had been frequent; between 1665 and 1668 there is scarcely any such action; after the latter date, the meetings again become active.

² In Hempstead the town-meeting and local board exercise concurrent legislative power both before and after the Duke's Laws.

³ In Huntington (*Records*, I.) and Southold (*Records*, I.) the bulk of local legislation is done by the town-meetings; there is very little record of ordinance power of the town board.

The most interesting of all these changes is to be seen in the determination of the suffrage. Since the principle of town and provincial freemanship was set aside by Nicholls, of necessity some other test of the citizen's "evident interest" in the government must be found; and naturally, at that time, the test required was the holding of land. Land was cheap; it was easily attainable; and its possession served better than any twentieth-century qualification, to mark off the socially upright man from the criminal and the vagrant. Nicholls had already proposed one principle in his letter providing for the election of delegates to the Hempstead meeting of 1665, "by the major part of the freemen only, which is to be understood, of all Persons rated according to their Estates, whether English or Dutch;"¹ thus making the payment of taxes on property (not poll-taxes alone), the qualification of voters.

In the Laws, four expressions are used in describing the voting class: "householders," "inhabitants housholders," "freeholders," and "Inhabitants freeholders, Housholders." It is believed that all these phrases refer to the same class of citizens;² and that the words "inhabitants" and "householders" are to be taken not in a substantive, but an adjective sense, qualifying the word "freeholders;" and thus the real definition of the voting class would be *inhabiting and householding freeholders*.³ No statement is made in the Laws of the size of freehold necessary to obtain the suffrage privilege, and perhaps the differences in town settlement and ordinances prevented such a general suffrage qualification. While the practice of the government was not uniform, it usually opposed small freeholds. In

¹ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 564.

² The evidence for this belief is drawn from two sources: (a) the internal evidence of the Laws; and (b) the practice of the towns.

(a) From the Laws. In one place the Laws speak of the election of overseers by the "Housholders," and in another place, by the "freeholders;" and similarly the election of the minister is said to be by "the Inhabitants housholders," and by the "Inhabitants freeholders housholders."

(b) From the town practice. The town records use the words as loosely as do the Laws. For instance in Southampton the phrases occur, "inhabitants or freeholders;" "freeholders;" "freeholders and Inhabitants" (*Records*, II. 279, 295, 305; also I. 135-138 note). In 1672 an election in Hempstead was contested because persons had voted who were freeholders indeed, but held only small tracts, and it was maintained that a man must be not only a freeholder, but a freeholder of a certain number of acres, in order to possess the suffrage (*N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 667). In 1676, Andros granted a patent to the town officers of Southold, for themselves and "their associats, the freeholders and Inhabitants of the s^d Town" and subsequently these officers state, "All which freeholders we doe fully own . . . to be our onely associats" (*Town Records*, II. 8-12). The last case shows that the town officers believed *inhabitants* to be a qualification of the word *freeholders*; a man must be an inhabitant and a freeholder to be qualified to vote.

³ "He who hath a house in his hands in a town, may be said to be an Inhabitant." Jacob's *Law Dictionary*, London, 1797.

1666 the court of assizes ordered, "Dividing of Towne Lotts, thereby multiplying poor freemen and votes to be rectified by the Sessions :"¹ and in 1680 the governor and council decided that none should have a vote in Flushing unless he possessed a quantity of land equal to that given out in the first town-lot distribution. This decision limited the suffrage to those possessing sixty acres or more in the town.² But this policy was not strictly adhered to, and in another case the decision is in favor of the small freeholder.³ Except in militia elections, where all the soldiers could vote, the possession of land in freehold thus appears to have been required of the voter on local matters, although there was no definite statement of the size of freehold required.⁴

Attention has now been called to the codes from which Nicholls copied, and the changes which he introduced. The code which he framed was drawn from New England, Dutch and English precedents, with some adaptations to the peculiar conditions of Long Island. In political organization, it was much narrower than the New England codes; since it permitted no popular participation in provincial government, and sought to deprive the town-meetings of their authority. In religious toleration it far outstripped the Puritanic legislation. On the other hand, even the small measure of popular government which the code granted was an advance upon the Dutch local government with its systems of double and triple nomination and close corporations. And thus while the Laws brought increased freedom for the Dutch inhabitants, they diminished the privileges of the English. The Dutch appear contented, but for a

¹ *Report of State Historian*, 1896, 341.

² "Whereas the former Constitution of the s^d Towne, at their first settlement, in the year 1654, was in dividing their home Lotts, into 4 acres a piece, then addi^on of six acres, and after that 50 more to each Inhabitant, None for the future shall be esteemed a Freeman of s^d Towne that hath not sixty acres of land within its limitts, besides meadows, . . . and such as shall have the like propor^on of land and no other to be esteemed Freeman for votes in publick or other town matters."—*N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 751.

³ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIV. 667.

⁴ Attention has been directed in some detail to the word "inhabitant" as used in the Laws, because its use here is similar to the common acceptance of the word in New York local legislation for over a hundred years. During the eighteenth century, the phrase "freeholder and inhabitant" occurs continuously in the provincial laws with regard to local affairs; and although the word "freeholder" is very carefully defined by statute (*N. Y. Col. Laws*, I. 112, 244, 405, 453; IV. 1094) no definition in all that time has been found for the word "inhabitant." The custom under the Duke's Laws shows that it was there regarded as qualifying the word "freeholder," and it is believed that the same meaning is to be put upon the word through the whole colonial period. If this inference were true, the suffrage for the colonial assembly was based on freeholdership, and a man might vote for representative wherever his land lay; in local matters, on the other hand, freeholdership and inhabitancy of the locality were both required of the voter.

generation the English struggled for their "birth-right privileges."

Although the military authority of the Duke was soon displaced by the civil organization in New York City and on Long Island, such was not the case in the outlying settlements on the Hudson and Delaware Rivers. Over ten years passed before a permanent civil government was established at those places. After the surrender of New Amsterdam to Nicholls, the latter sent his representative to receive the submission of the several settlements along the Hudson River. No resistance was met with, and the Dutch were promised their civil privileges and the confirmation of their magistrates. At Rensselaerswyck the patroon was granted all the privileges which he had enjoyed under the Dutch.¹ But in spite of promises, the real authority among the up-river settlements came from the military commanders. The local magistrates, indeed, were still retained under the old Dutch name of "commissaries;"² and the old system of double nominations by the court was continued.³ But the military authorities came into conflict with the Dutch citizens, and special commissioners with large powers were sent up the river to investigate the causes of the trouble,⁴ and in 1669 regulated the affairs of the settlements on the Esopus.⁵ These commissioners appointed the local officers, and took steps for the introduction of the Duke's Laws into these settlements.

By degrees the authority was taken from special commissioners and military commanders, and a government established after the form of the Laws, therefore it was "desird a Copy of the Lawes may be sent them."⁶ In April, 1670, the military provisions of the Laws were enforced, the inhabitants were drilled according to the requirements of the Laws, and "all the Lawes relateing to Military Affaires were read to them."⁷ Over a year passed before any further features of the Laws were adopted. In October, 1671, the governor ordered that the towns on the Esopus should follow, in the administration, the rules of the Laws; that a court of sessions should sit semi-annually on the Esopus, and that appeals might be had from it to the court of assizes at New York.⁸ Many English settlers were now entering the Esopus region, and their presence

¹ Munsell, *Annals of Albany*, VII. 97.

² Munsell, *Historical Collections of Albany*, IV. 390-509 *passim*.

³ Munsell, *Annals of Albany*, VI. 20; *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 439.

⁴ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 406-415.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 428-431.

⁶ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 438.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 449.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 459-460.

perhaps made possible the definite establishment of the Laws. After particular features of the Laws had been adopted from time to time, the governor and council finally decided, on June 12, 1673, to enforce all the Laws :

“The Petition from severall of the Inhabitants at Esopus being taken into Consideration, wherein they desire to have the Privilege and Benefitt of Enjoyment of the English Lawes Establishd by his Royall Highnesse and in practice almost throughout all his Territoryes. It is Ordered, that the said Lawes shall bee settled and practized in the Three Townes of Esopus as in other Places, for the^{w^h} they shall receive particular Instructions. In the meantime the Inhabit^{ts} of Marbleton and Hurley have Liberty to make choice in each Towne by a double vote of a Constable and Overseers and return their Names unto the Governour, who will out of them pitch upon the Persons to bee confirmed in that Employment for the ensuing years.”¹

It is to be noted that the governor again introduced here the system of double nomination, and in a manner which was not provided for in the Laws.² The contemplated extension of the Laws was interfered with by the re-occupation of the country by the Dutch, but upon the return to the English, Andros was instructed by the Duke to put in force the Laws, except such as he thought inconvenient.³ Accordingly, a few days after his arrival at New York, Andros, by proclamation, declared the Laws in force and directed “All Magistrates and Civill Officers belonging thereunto to be chosen and establishd accordingly.”⁴ From this time, there are no further references to double nominations, and it is believed that the provisions of the Laws were literally carried out.

At about the same time that the demand for the surrender of the Hudson settlements was made, Sir Robert Carre was sent to the Delaware territories to receive their submission. Under him the only blood was shed which accompanied the change from Dutch to English authority ; but at last, on October 1, 1664, six Dutchmen, for themselves and the other inhabitants on the river, signed articles of capitulation, which corresponded in the main to those already given in New York City and the upper Hudson River

¹ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XIII. 471.

² The combination of the town government of the Duke's Laws with the double-nomination system of the Dutch, is to be seen also in Harlem. Nicholls granted a qualified town charter to Harlem in 1666, and followed it by a broader grant in 1667. By the charter of 1666, Harlem was granted the “privileges of a Town,” but not with the full measure of local government permitted to the towns on Long Island ; for the constable and overseers were not selected directly by the people, but by the authorities from a double popular nomination. In other respects the town had the privileges of the Long Island towns. See Riker, *History of Harlem*, 239-255.

³ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, III. 226.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 227.

towns ; and provided for no immediate change in political organization.¹

The Dutch local government continued under these terms, but always in subordination to the military authority of the English commander on the river. By the orders of the governor and council on April 21, 1668, this dual form of government is well illustrated. The civil government in the respective plantations was to be continued until further orders,² but in case of dispute, the military commander was to call to his assistance five named inhabitants to act as counsellors, and this body, in which the commander had a double vote in case of a tie, was to decide civil cases, and give advice concerning the Indian trade and the arming of the several plantations.³ Furthermore, steps were taken, as was being done on the Esopus at the same time, for the introduction of the Duke's Laws :

"the Lawes of the Governmn^t Establisht by his Royall Highnes be shewed and frequently Communicated to the said Councello^{rs} and all oth^{rs} To the end that being there wth acquainted *the practise of them may also in Convenient tyme be established.*"⁴

Several years passed by, however, and the change to the Duke's Laws was not made. In 1670 and 1671 we find references to schouts and commissaries, who have the duties of the old Dutch officers.⁵

The adoption of the Laws in the Delaware territories came more gradually and much less completely than it did in the upper Hudson settlements. In June, 1671, the governor granted the petition of the inhabitants of Newcastle for civil officers and town privileges.⁶ In November of the same year the militia provisions of the Laws were extended, and it was ordered that the inhabitants "bee digested into severall Companyes as the Townes and number of Men will permitt," and that the officers be elected by the soldiers and commissioned by the governor.⁷

A further extension of the Laws came in April, 1672, when Captain Walter Wharton was commissioned by Governor Lovelace as justice of the peace on the Delaware. Wharton had the power to nominate by himself, or cause to be elected, a constable and two overseers, with whom he was to hear petty civil cases ; in the decision of which and in all matters of government he was directed

¹ See *ante*, p. 695.

² *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XII. 461.

³ *Ibid.*, XII. 462.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Hazard, *Annals of Pennsylvania*, 380, 383.

⁶ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XII. 480-482.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 487.

"to follow and observe the Lawes Establisht in his Royall Highness his Territoryes and to follow such Orders and Directions as from time to time hee shall receive from " the governor.¹ By this time there were at least three local courts on the Delaware; the settlements near Cape Henlopen, called the Whorekill plantation, had retained their commissaries and schout since the Dutch period; the Newcastle settlements had likewise their separate court, although under the shadow of the commander's power; and another court for the Schuylkill settlements had existed in 1660;² but no direct evidence remains that this last court continued its sessions under the English. In 1672 there was, however, a court in existence at Upland (Chester), and it is believed that this was only the old Dutch court, with its place of meeting changed some time during the years 1660-1672 from Tinnicum Island near the Schuylkill to the mainland at Upland (Chester).³ In May, 1672, Newcastle was incorporated by the governor, and the Dutch practices of partial retirement and double nomination introduced into the town government.⁴

The few months' occupation by the Dutch in 1673 and 1674 had little effect upon political development on the Delaware. The three courts were continued, and four magistrates for each selected by the governor and council from a double nomination by the "inhabitants."⁵ Upon the restoration of the country to the English, Andros issued orders for the reinstatement of the officers who had held commissions when the Dutch took possession.⁶ The commissaries, or magistrates of each of the local courts, were directed to cause an election of constables.⁷ In the following spring, May, 1675, Andros visited Newcastle and held a special court. And at

¹ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XII. 495.

² *Ibid.*, 311.

³ Hazard, *Annals of Penna.*, 398. Upland Court Record, *Memoirs of Hist. Soc. of Penna.*, VII. 31. Mr. Armstrong, the editor of the Record, believes "that the earliest tribunal under English sanction, within the limits of what is now the state of Pennsylvania, held its sittings at Upland, since called Chester." He does not ask the question of the fate of the court at Tinnicum Island, nor whether it persisted under the English, nor whether it were merely moved from Tinnicum to Upland. So far as I know, the documents of the period are silent on this point.

⁴ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XII. 496. The officers of the "Balywick" were to be a bailiff (called "a Bailey"), and six assistants. Four of the assistants were to retire annually and others were to be chosen in their stead; the bailiff was to be chosen by the governor from a double nomination made to him. A sheriff was to be appointed for the corporation and the whole river by the governor from a similar nomination. In none of these cases is mention made of the method of election or nomination.

⁵ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XII. 508.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 513; the old bailiff, Peter Alricks, was especially excluded from this reinstatement.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 514.

last the final step in the establishment of English laws on the Delaware came in an order from the governor, dated September 22, 1676.

"Whereas upon a petiçon of the Magistrates and officers of New Castle and Delaware River, Governor Lovelace did resolve and in part settle the Establish^t Lawes of this Government and appoint some Magistrates under an English Denominaçon accordingly, In the which their having been an obstruction for reason of the late warres and Change of Government; And findeing now an absolute necessity for the well being of the Inhabitants, to make a speedy settlement, to bee a generall knowne rule unto them for the future, Vpon mature deliberation and advice of my Councell, I have resolved, and by vertue of the Authority derived unto mee, doe hereby in his Ma^{ties} Name Order as followeth.

"1. That the booke of lawes Established by his Royall Highnesse, and practiced in New Yorke, Long Island, and Dependences bee likewise in force, and practiced in this River and Precincts, Except the Constables Courts, Country Rates, and some other things peculiar to Long Island, and the Millitia as now Ordered to remaine in the King, but that a Constable in each place bee yearly chosen for the Preservaçon of his Ma^{ties} Peace with all other Power as directed by the law."¹

The order then went on to recognize three courts, at Whorekill, Newcastle and Upland, to be composed of the justices of the peace, and having criminal jurisdiction, and civil jurisdiction up to the value of twenty pounds; and possessing the power to make by-laws for their respective districts, not repugnant to the laws of the government. A sheriff was to be appointed for the whole Delaware territory. Taxes could be levied, except in extraordinary emergencies, only with the consent of the governor.

The frame of government thus established differed in large measure from that which had been formed for Long Island. No provision is made for town-meetings either by the constable and overseers, or by the inhabitants; and it is certain that no town-meeting, in the New England sense of the term, was ever held by the inhabitants on the Delaware under this order.² The only elective officers provided for were the constables, and in one instance, at least, even the constable was chosen by the court, and not elected by the people.³ The militia officers were not elected by the soldiers, as on Long Island and in New England, but "to remain in the King," *i. e.*, appointed by the governor. The sheriff was appointed

¹ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XII. 561-563.

² E. R. L. Gould, in *Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science*, I. 3: 27, implies that the New England town system was introduced into Pennsylvania by this order of Andros. There is absolutely no documentary proof for this view, and the facts given above show that the system actually established was widely different from the New England, or even the Long Island custom.

³ Upland Court Record, *Memoirs of Hist. Soc. of Pa.*, VII. 184.

by the governor also; and the magistrates of the three courts were commissioned by the governor, for "one year . . . or till further order."¹ In actual practice, the magistrates often held their offices for more than a year; the justices of the Upland court were first commissioned on September 23, 1676, and their commissions were not renewed until June 8, 1680.² In other cases a shorter time passed before renewal.³ As these courts were the local legislature and judiciary, and the sheriff their executive, it will be seen that this system had little of the elective and popular features of the Long Island laws. On Long Island each town had its overseers, exercising local legislative and judicial powers, and elected by the town-meeting; the constables and other local officers were elected by the same body; all soldiers had a voice in the election of militia officers; and the town-meetings, although not authorized by law, actually exercised large legislative powers. Of these various popular features, only the election of the constable was introduced into the Delaware region, and it is doubtful if that election was performed by the inhabitants. All other matters were left to the courts.⁴

The change which was accomplished, then, by the introduction of the Duke's Laws on the Delaware, was very slight. The three courts were maintained and their powers enlarged and more carefully defined. The criminal and civil provisions of the Laws, and the fees there established, were to guide the justices upon the Delaware. But the main political and military features were not extended. No stronger proof of the slightness of the change could be found than the fact that over two years passed before a copy of the Duke's Laws was sent to the Newcastle court, although it had frequently petitioned the governor for a copy.⁵ In course of time, other courts were organized upon the Delaware,⁶ and some efforts were made to establish a general court, perhaps similar to the assizes in New York, which should have legislative and taxing power for all the Delaware settlements, but this plan was not favored by the governor, and during the remainder of the period of the Duke's government, the

¹ *Upland Court Record*, 38.

² *Ibid.*, 37; 165.

³ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XII. 635; *Penna. Archives*, second series, V. 684-685, 690, 699, 704, 706, 718.

⁴ See *Upland Court Record*, p. 184-185, for appointment of overseers of highways by court. Also *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XII. 606, 650 for two instances of nomination of magistrates.

⁵ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XII. 576, 581, 590, 606, 608; *Penna. Archives*, second series, V. 697, 706.

⁶ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XII. 610, 635; Hazard, *Annals*, 472.

separate courts were retained, with no general sessions for the whole territory.¹

It will be seen from these few facts that the political development of the Delaware settlements from the times of the Dutch until the establishment of Penn's and Markham's "frames," was continuous. There was no attempt to force New England customs upon the inhabitants ; and if the effort had been made it could not have succeeded. The English simply continued the local courts of the Dutch, and as the population of the settlements increased, the power and authority of the courts developed. The three divisions of the river settlements appeared at an early period ; they were adopted as the basis for the jurisdiction of the Dutch courts ; and upon them at a later day the county court system and county organization of Pennsylvania were based.

We have now made the circuit of the territories taken by the English from the Dutch, and have noted the manner in which the Dutch and English institutions acted upon each other. We have seen English governors placed over a population made up of Dutch, Swedes and English ; we have watched attempts to transplant New England institutions bodily into New Netherland ; and we have followed English officials, who with definite English political experience in mind, have come into contact with Dutch practices. The outcome is an interesting one, and naturally one which is a resultant of the several forces at work. Dutch, English and New England elements are seen in the result, combined with new features derived from the peculiar conditions of the country. The product is not altogether Dutch nor altogether English, much less is it drawn entirely from New England.

The degree to which the several elements entered into the ultimate constitution was determined, among other causes, by geographical conditions, and principal among these conditions was the grouping of population according to nationalities. English forms and New England practices were introduced first into Long Island, where the population was overwhelmingly English by race and attached to New England by sympathies. In New York City, on the other hand, in spite of a large influx of Englishmen, the Dutch practices of local government, if not the titles of officers, were retained until 1653, and not entirely abandoned after that date. Up the Hudson we have noticed a gradual extension of the English laws, which was accompanied by the entrance of many English settlers into the river lands. On the Delaware, the English institutions were more largely influenced by the Dutch and Swedish cus-

¹ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, XII. 564, 575, 581, 591.

toms than anywhere else, and here, also, the English settlers, until Penn's day, were fewest in number.

Other conditions, too, prevented the entire establishment of English laws. A town-meeting in New York City, with all its mingled races and languages, would have been an absurdity; and this cosmopolitan character of the population required a representative or centrally administered municipal government. On the Delaware, where the settlers were scattered over large farms, the town-meeting and town activity were impossible. Again, policy required a toleration of all religions where no one sect was in the ascendancy, and Dutch practice furnished a good precedent for this. Thus, local conditions often forced the adoption of policies variant from Dutch, English or New England practices.

Finally, the Dutch features which were retained for a time, or permanently, may be noted. The Dutch centrally organized provincial government without popular representation was maintained for almost twenty years; the Dutch principles of double or triple nomination and partial retirement are seen in the county and town government; the judicial powers of the constable and overseers had a Dutch parallel; the county system on the Delaware was a development from earlier Dutch customs; some features of Dutch land-tenure persisted upon the patroon estates; the exclusive trade-privileges of New York City and its principle of municipal freeman-ship were retained from Dutch days; and Dutch religious toleration gave a precedent for the later religious freedom, although it must not be taken as the sole cause of that liberty.

ALBERT E. MCKINLEY.

DOCUMENTS

1. Letters of Dr. Thomas Cooper, 1825-1832.

MR. WILLIAM NELSON, JR., Corresponding Secretary of the New Jersey Historical Society, and the possessor of the papers of Mahlon Dickerson, has extracted from that collection the following letters of the famous Dr. Thomas Cooper, which he has kindly permitted the REVIEW to use. Dickerson, an eminent Democratic politician of New Jersey, was a senator of the United States from 1817 to 1833, and these letters are, with one exception, addressed to him at Washington. In some respects they have a close relation to the correspondence which forms the second group of documents in the present issue of the REVIEW, and they might have been classed with them; for they cast light on that stage of South Carolina politics, previous to 1828, when Calhoun was still reckoned among the nationals and conservatives, and when the line of cleavage in state politics ran between him and his friends Hamilton and Hayne and McDuffie on the one hand, and the extremer state-rights men led by Judge Smith on the other hand. But on the whole the main interest of these letters lies in their relation to Dr. Cooper's petition for the restoration of the fine inflicted upon him by Justice Chase in 1800, under the Sedition Act, on account of a newspaper libel on the President, and in their characteristic exhibition of the traits which so strongly marked Cooper himself, the "learned, ingenious, scientific and talented madcap" of John Adams's pungent phrase.

After his brief and eccentric career as a Pennsylvania judge, 1806-1811, and after a brief service as professor of chemistry in Dickinson College and in the University of Pennsylvania, Cooper was in 1819 elected to the same chair in the South Carolina College, and in 1820 became its president. This was the position which he occupied at the time when these letters were written. There seems to be no question that, with his extraordinary acquirements, energy and versatility, he was a most stimulating and effective teacher, and left a permanent mark upon the intellectual life of the institution. But his heterodoxy in matters of religion, set forth with characteristic aggressiveness and pugnacity, aroused so much excitement and indignation in the state, that he was put

upon his trial by a resolution of the South Carolina House of Representatives, passed December 7, 1831, "That in the opinion of this House it is expedient that the board of trustees of the South Carolina College do forthwith investigate the conduct of Doctor Cooper as president of the South Carolina College, and if they find that his continuance in office defeats the ends and aims of the institution that they be requested to remove him." This prosecution explains the last letter here printed. Though the board exonerated the doctor, after a brilliant defense on his part, he was forced to resign in 1834 and died in 1840.¹

It was in 1825, apparently, that he began his efforts to secure the repayment of the fine of 1800. His petition of February, 1825, a well-written document,² argued forcibly that there was no libel in the newspaper statements for which he had been prosecuted, and that the Sedition Act of 1798 was unconstitutional. It was referred in the Senate to a select committee, of which Senator Dickerson was chairman, and which reported favorably.³ In 1826 an adverse report was made by the Judiciary Committee of the House.⁴ In 1832, 1834, 1836 and 1838 the Committee brought in a favorable report with a bill for repayment of the fine with interest.⁵ But no restitution was made during Dr. Cooper's lifetime.⁶

I.

COLUMBIA Tuesday 18 Jan. 1825

Dear Sir

I am obliged to Mr Gaillard⁷ for the documents he has sent which are very acceptable.

I sent you the beginning of this month a petition hastily drawn up,

¹ See Dr. Colyer Meriwether's *History of Higher Education in South Carolina*, pp. 143-156.

² It is printed as *Senate Document* No. 30, Eighteenth Congress, second session; in each of the reports mentioned in the third note below; and at the end of Cooper's *Two Essays: 1. On the Foundation of Civil Government; 2. On the Constitution of the United States*, Columbia, 1826.

³ *Senate Document* No. 38, Eighteenth Congress, second session.

⁴ *House Report* No. 16, Nineteenth Congress, first session.

⁵ *Reports of Committees*, No. 244, Twenty-second Congress, first session; No. 473, Twenty-third Congress, first session; No. 303, Twenty-fourth Congress, first session; No. 343, Twenty-fifth Congress, second session.

⁶ It is sometimes said that the fine was repaid to Cooper; but I find no such act of Congress, and in 1847 and 1850 Cooper's executor is still petitioning. *House Report* No. 37, Twenty-ninth Congress, second session; No. 11, Thirty-first Congress, first session.

⁷ John Gaillard, senator from South Carolina, and president *pro tempore* of the Senate in this and several preceding Congresses. The other senator at this time was Robert Y. Hayne. The Carolina congressmen mentioned below were George McDuffie, James Hamilton, jr., Joel R. Poinsett, Joseph Gist, Starling Tucker, and John Wilson.

owing to my expecting you w^d write to me if the time suited. As I have not heard from you I think it may have miscarried. My consolidation pamphlet¹ has affronted Col. Hayne and M^o Duffie sadly. Nor will my petition be supported by Jackson's friends who go with Calhoun in his views on this subject. However, act as you see fit. In the H. of Representatives, I c^d not trust from our State Hamilton or Poinsett, who are of the Calhoun and Adams politics: and Gist, Tucker, and Wilson are not of standing to take a lead. My Compts to Mr Gaillard. I remain Dear Sir

Yours truly

TH. COOPER.

II.

COLUMBIA South Carolina

Feb. 13. 1826

Dear Sir

I have not yet heard of the two boxes.² A bookseller John Doyle of New York, writes to me that he saw 2 small boxes [direc]ted for me at the former store of Wilder and Campbell [books]ellers at New York who have broken and quitted the store. [He] says he has taken them and sent them on to me. These may or may not be the boxes you were so kind as to send: if you [recol]lect to whom they were consigned in New York, pray write for me to John Doyle Bookseller Park Place New York, and request him to look after them for me.

I have written to Major Hamilton,³ such hints and suggestions as occurred to me, presuming he would communicate them to you. If he has not, pray ask him for my letters; they may furnish some ideas: if not they are soon perused.

Do not let my personal interest in the petition stand in the way [of] any public measure, for a moment. If you can carry any [bil]l or any resolution valuable to the public by giving up my [cla]im, do not hesitate a moment. What I want is, to impress the public out of doors with the absolute necessity of full and free discussion of every question within the range of human enquiry in order to arrive at Truth. The whole doctrine of Libel is in direct hostility with the improvement of mankind. I know of no question so important as the right of free discussion, untrammelled à priori, and subject to no punishment for its exercise. Of course I mean to confine this to *public* questions, and not to give the reins to private slander. But I include political measures as to their motives and tendency, and the public character and conduct of all public men. I include also every metaphysical and theological question. If Error be not brought to the light how can it be confuted? Have [you] looked at Mill's essay on the right of free discussion in [the] Supplement

¹ *Consolidation: An Account of Parties in the United States, from the Convention of 1787 to the Present Period*, by Thomas Cooper, Columbia, 1824.

² Of minerals. In another letter Dr. Cooper says that these boxes "interest me, I believe, full as much as the petition."

³ James Hamilton, jr., M.C., afterward governor.

to the Encyclopaedia Britann[ica].¹ The Westminster Review contains two admirable papers, one on prosecutions for blasphemy, and the other in the 3rd Vol on the doctrine of Libel.²

I am extremely sorry for the acc^t you give me of Gaillard.³ I sincerely hope he may recover.

I suspect Tazewell⁴ is against me on my petition: nor do I count upon Hayne: but I care nothing about it. I am only anxious that in the debate, my friends should take the broad ground of unlimited, unpunishable enquiry, [in] case of public men, public measures, and public questions [of] every description. Adieu. With much kind respect I remain Dear Sir Y^r friend

THOMAS COOPER.

III.

COLUMBIA March 16. 1826

Dear Sir

On Saturday next, Mr Harper⁵ of this place sets out for Washington to supply the vacancy of our deceased friend Gaillard. He is a lawyer; formerly a judge in Missouri; chancellor I think. Idle; not having used industry to lay up a stock of useful information; unknowing as I think in political questions; a prodigious admirer of the late W^m Pitt the british minister (the worst in my opinion that nation ever had) and I think inclined to go all lengths with the administration particularly in favour of internal improvements and against state-rights, provided Calhoun does not lead him. But as Harper's brother in law here, Col. Preston,⁶ is gained over by Calhoun, I think Harper will follow that leader also. In all other respects, I think Mr. Harper has an excellent head, and an excellent heart. I *believe* he means to oppose our friend Judge Smith, who will be a candidate as I suspect to succeed Gaillard and who is popular enough I believe and hope to carry the election against Harper: Smith's politics are like my own, radical, and therefore I wish him the success which I think he will obtain.

Your proposal to extend the time of prohibition for a twelve month longer than the resolution of the Committee pleased me greatly.⁷ I hope you will persist in, and carry it. I am persuaded that the present attempts to throw the election of President exclusively into the hands of the people

¹ See James Mill's *Essays*.

² *Westminster Review*, II. 1, "Religious Prosecutions," and III. 285, "Law of Libel and Liberty of the Press."

³ Senator Gaillard died February 26, 1826; see Benton, *Thirty Years' View*, I. 77, 78.

⁴ Senator from Virginia.

⁵ William Harper, appointed by the governor, served as senator only till December, 1826, when Judge William Smith, elected, took his place. Harper was afterwards chancellor of South Carolina.

⁶ William C. Preston, afterward senator.

⁷ December 19, 1825, Dickerson proposed a constitutional amendment limiting the re-eligibility of the President; it was then also proposed to prohibit the appointment of Congressmen to federal office during their terms; to which was added, the next day, "and for——thereafter." *Senate Journal*, pp. 46, 54.

is a Consolidation-measure. The election of President according to the principles of our constitution is a State affair, and ought to be managed by the States, and not by the people. Our government is a federal union of States, for foreign and extraneous purposes, and ought not to interfere in any thing domestic that the States separately can manage for themselves. But executive influence is going on so rapidly, that in a few years it will be overwhelming. Your proposal will be one main stoppage to its progress.

I observe Walsh and Niles¹ are attacking J. Randolph. I think his arguments are well calculated to make us hesitate. If a minister is to be sent to the Congress at Panama, I hope his hands will be well tied. If Cuba should be placed in a revolutionary State, it will at present be a black government, and the people of Cuba joined to the rascally tribe of Wilberforce's evangelical reformers, will surrender all the british west indies into the hands of the blacks.

I do not say the blacks are a distinct species: but I have not the slightest doubt of their being an inferior variety of the human species; and not capable of the same improvement as the whites.

Adieu. I remain

Dear Sir

Yr obliged friend

THOMAS COOPER.

IV.²

August 31. 1826 COLUMBIA S. Carolina.

Dear Sir

I have been considering and reconsidering my case with a view to the formidable objection raised by Mr Webster and the government party, that the Legislature have no right to impugn or interfere with a judicial decision. As the Constitution now stands, and under the received construction of it, I think that is the case; and so much the worse for the people who have secured to them by the amendments to the Constitution the empty privilege of petitioning [for] redress of grievances [a H.] of Representatives who have no power [to] give them relief, however flagrant the injustice complained of. The liberties of the Country are given up into the hands of the judiciary to be molded by them at their discretion as a Potter moulds his clay. They are removed *out* of the power of the popular body, *into* the power of a Presidential body.

The only grounds I have to stand upon are,

1.st The fine belongs now to the Treasury of the United States. I ask it to be restored, because under all circumstances it is right and proper it should be so. This does not impeach, overturn or alter the decision of the Court. With that I have nothing to do. Let it stand. But like an award of Damages by a Jury, the party to whom damages are given may renounce or restore them without any impeachment of the ver-

¹ Robert Walsh, of the *National Gazette*, and Niles of the *Register*.

² Addressed: "Honourable Mahlon Dickerson, Suckasunny, New Jersey."

dict that awarded them. To this case therefore the objection does not apply. On the 30th of June 1825 Mr Brougham applied for a remission of the fines imposed by the Court on Richard Carlisle for libels, amounting to 1500 £. The fines were remitted in Sep^r without impeaching the Judgement of the Court; upon which no opinion was passed either by the house or the Ministers.

2. Without impugning or alluding to the Judgement of the Court [may] not the house doubt of their own power to pass the act, and therefore remit the fine because they disapprove of the Law passed by themselves without regard to the Judgement of the Court? I ask them to rectify their own mistake, not the mistake of the Court.

3.^y To doubt of the correctness of a mere *Nisi prius* opinion, not founded on any solemn decision of the Supreme court, never considered here or in England as settling the Law on any question, still less on a question of this manifest importance, is no impeachment of or resistance to the rights of the Judiciary ultimately to pass upon the question. To say that a law is not constitutional, whose constitutionality has never been argued before [the Su]preme court, is not creating any conflict with judicial authority. [Wh]ere will you stop? If a *nisi prius* decision on a point suggested and never argued even at *nisi prius* is binding, would not the objection taken in my Case lie even to an *obiter dictum*—a transitory assertion—a mere suggestion? I contend that the rule of non-interference applies only to those points that have been solemnly adjudged on argument before the supreme court as the tribunal of last resort. To say that the legislature of the Country have no right to give an opinion or express a doubt on the hasty suggestion of a judge in a circuit case, is degrading them before the judiciary power to an extent that can hardly be contended for. But this is my case. The question was not argued before Chase, nor carried up, because the temporary predominance of party feelings at the time, gave little hopes for success, and the expence and trouble of an argument at Washington would be far more grievous than the fine.

4. Where the opinions of the Legislature and the Judiciary are likely to be at variance, the predominant power claimed by the Judiciary ought to [be cle]ar and beyond a doubt: it ought to be claimed not in a dubious but manifest case, and when opposed to the rights of the people as insisted on by the Representatives of the People, it should be construed strictly to be construed reasonably. Under this rule of construction it cannot apply to a mere *nisi prius* decision.

Such are the only expedient arguments I can suggest under existing circumstances. But if the power of the Judiciary be not curtailed, the liberties of the people are gone. To make every class of constitutional authorities subservient to a power under Presidential bias if not controul—placed far above, aloof from the people—who have no point of contact or intercourse, no sympathy with the people—who may commit injuries and give rise to grievances which the people complain of in vain, for they complain to a powerless, prostrated [House] of Representatives—thus to

construe the Constitution, is to make [it] whatever the Judges choose to make it. Look at the caution against the judiciary in General Hamilton's excellent argument in the people v. Crosswell 3 Johnson's Cases 337.¹ When you add to this influence, the sweeping power under General Welfare, and the United States Bank, I am tempted to exclaim C'en est fait de nous.

Yours truly

THOMAS COOPER.

Pray write to me, how stands the motion about the Judiciary in your [house?] Did not Van Beuren introduce some clauses and Rowan some amendments? Who and what is Rowan?² I think Van B. spoke too much like a Lawyer. The fulsome panegyrics on the Sup. Court are not deserved. They are all ultra federalists but W. Johnson, and he is a conceited man without talents.

v.

COLUMBIA Jan. 18 1829

My dear Sir

I am glad you have brought on again your motion. It is in my opinion prudent and honest, and will *check* the extravagances of internal Improvement, if it cannot prevent them.

I hope you have read my essay on Malaria, with your ponds and Shrubberys in full recollection. I do not like them.

I write to introduce to your notice an intelligent and worthy young man, Thomas[Jefferson] Withers, who is politically all you could wish, saving as to the Tariff. You must allow us in the South, to look through our own coloured Spectacles, and you through yours. It may be a measure gainful to the Middle States, but it will be death to us. However, I have done with it. I shall oppose it no more. I will remove to either Louisiana or the Mississippi territory.³ I should prefer the latter. Here I will not stay. Pray introduce Withers to the Mississippi members that he may make inquiries for me. I live here the life of a Toad under a harrow.⁴ Now and then I get a small box of minerals which cheer me; you cannot conceive at this my second childhood, how gratified I am with these play things. They really add much to my pleasures. I look at my collection every week, with the eyes of a Collector and the feelings of one. Adieu. Will Hamilton bring on the Sedition Law? He is a good fellow, although he be an anti Tariffite like

Your friend and humble Ser^t

THOMAS COOPER.

¹The prosecution of Harry Crosswell, in 1803, for libel on Jefferson; Alexander Hamilton was of counsel for Crosswell.

²John Rowan, senator from Kentucky 1825-1831.

³The reading of this sentence is not quite certain.

⁴Cooper's anti-clerical sentiments and outspoken heterodoxy were making trouble for him in his capacity as president of the college.

VI.

COLUMBIA S. Carolina
Dec. 10. 1829.

Dear Sir

My friend Hamilton having quitted political life, I know not in the H. of Representatives who I could most properly apply to, on the subject of my Petition. Hamilton said he would speak to his Successor, Mr. Barnewell¹: but I never saw that Gentleman, and Hamilton has not written to me whether he applied to him or not. Any of the delegates of our State would do me this service, but I do not chuse to apply to Mr McDuffie; or indeed any of them without consulting you.

I hope you will not forsake this question, and I therefore request of you to choose your own coadjutor in the H. of Representatives. Pray write to me on it. Barnewell is a clever, eloquent young man; but I know little about him.

In this strait, I must depend upon you, as I trust I may. Adieu. I am with all kindness and respect

Dear sir

Y^r friend

THOMAS COOPER.

VII.

COLUMBIA, S. Carolina.
8 Feb. 1830.

Dear Sr.

I thank you for y^r letter. I am glad my friend Davis² embarks in the cause of my Petition, which I leave with full confidence in your hands.

But remember that although 1000 \$ w^d be to me a most convenient windfall at this moment, do not scruple no not for an instant to give up all my interest in the fate of that Petition if it stands in the way of the acknowledgement or establishment of any important principle or resolution as to the right of free discussion, I hope in its fullest extent. I am well aware of y^r inclination to render me personal service, but I w^d not for *any* emolument, disgrace my character by pressing agst the chance of public utility, any private interest of my own. Hamilton knows this was always my language to him. Do you therefore use my petition as an instrument of overturning the rascally imposition on the freedom of the press, which the Adams Dynasty w^d willingly fasten upon it: when my petition throws any difficulty in the way of this public object, throw my petition aside.

I rejoice to hear your works are in such good order and promise. I am neither surprised, nor do I blame y^r adherence to the Tariff, and if any body is to gain by that measure, it will give me great satisfaction to find it at any rate of Service to you.

Let me hear from you now and then.

THOMAS COOPER.

¹ Robert W. Barnwell of Beaufort.

² Warren R. Davis, M. C. from South Carolina.

VIII.

COLUMBIA March 13 1830

Dear Sir

Gen. Hayne wrote to me that he had presented the Report of the Senate in my favour.

I did not take a rec^d from Hall the Marshall. I took for granted that *my discharge from his custody* was a receipt in full ; for my sentence of course was, to be committed till the fine was paid.

It happened in this way. Hall called on me in the morning and told me that my term of confinement was ended, and I was free to leave the prison. I answered that I had not yet paid my fine, but expected to pay it that day. He said it was no matter, I might pay it when convenient. We went out together and met Israel Israel. In the street, a few minutes after, the Postman delivered me a letter containing a draught for 400 Dls drawn on Abel Humphrys of South Second Street Phila^a at 2 months. Israel Israel went to him to get him to discount the draught, which being a bitter english federalist he positively refused. I. Israel then went to St. Girard, [who] gave him the money for it without charging discount and I gave [it] to Hall. Probably J. E. Hall of the Portfolio¹ recollects [*illegible*]. But suppose a man on Ca Sa at liberty with consent of the sheriff is not that a [satisfaction of?] the debt?

C^d you not draw up the clause so as to get rid of this objection, if indeed it be one?

Buchanan's support will give me a very good opinion of the man, considering my obnoxious character to the Federalists.

Could you write a note to S. Girard to look in Ap. 1800 for a bill on Abel Humphreys in favour of Th. Cooper for 400 \$ discounted by him? He w^d probably take trouble for you as a Senator that he w^d not for me.²

I feel for y^r loss in that fine woman your niece. But so things are.

I am with many thanks Yr friend

THOMAS COOPER.

IX.

29 March 1830

COLUMBIA.

Dear Sir

I thank you for the bill in my favour. I shall avoid [*illegible*] worms, though I have the bill.

[I] forget the day when I left prison. I have no memorandum about it. [Will] you write for me to St. Girard, and verify his discounting a bill for 400\$ drawn on Abel Humphreys of Philadelphia. I will write to Tho^s Sergeant and get him to go to old Mrs. Hall.³ If my

¹ John E. Hall edited the Portfolio from 1817 to 1827. He was the son of John Hall, U. S. marshal for the district of Pennsylvania.

² At the end of *House Report* No. 244, Twenty-second Congress, first session, Dr. Cooper, in an affidavit dated February 4, 1831, says that he has written to Philadelphia, but can trace no entry of the transaction in the books of Stephen Girard, which, he understands, do not go so far back in his banking transactions.

³ Mrs. Sarah Hall, the marshal's widow, a literary lady, died April 8, 1830.

being at large is not legal proof of the fact, I have no other. Israel Israel who went to Girards and paid the money over to the Marshall is dead. Is it Secretary Van Beuren I am to satisfy? If it depends on him, he will be as scrupulous as legal habits can make him. Pray try and smooth this part of the path for me. I have no doubt St. Girard will remember the whole matter.

I am reviewing Bentham's late work in 5 V. on Judicial Evidence. It is really a most abstruse, but mind-exciting book. It will not be [rea]d; for I find the Hebrew lessons I have been taking these six months [pas]t, not so difficult as Bentham's pages. When I have finished, and can get a few copies struck off I will send you one.

With many thanks Adieu.

THOMAS COOPER.

X.

COLUMBIA Feb. 22. 1832

My dear friend

Hot work I find in your house. What with the Tariff and Van Beuren, the battle waxes hot. I do not care one cent about Janus, but tho' I *do* care about the Tariff, I am content to leave you and our man Hayne to carry on the contest. Where people cannot honestly agree, they must be contented to differ with mutual toleration. But rely upon it, the Tariff of protection will be very [much] of a storm-breeder. I wish it were settled, at the expence of the [time?] bestowed upon it.

Warren Davis, who is a kind and good creature, tho' like myself a sad Nullifier, tells me he has brought on my petition.¹ I hope you will make a handle of it to give us a proper good lecture on the right of free discussion in a republican government. I shall be curious to hear what John Quincey has to say to it. I do not expect it will pass for I am in no respect as yet in the odour of sanctity with the conclave at Washington. I regret your Tariff propensities, excuseable as they are, because they bring you so much in friendly contact with the notion-mongers of yankee-land: they are a race man-ward tarnation twistical; they will be very apt to lead you astray, and put your political chastity in imminent danger. See how readily Webster and Everett with their solemn sabbath-day faces, can go in and out of every political whore-house they meet with, without a change of feature in their unblushable faces. As to Clay, his roguery has a character of honest boldness about it, that makes people ready to forgive a consistent politician with! pretensions. However, as you love your honest character, keep aloof from all demure-looking sanctimonious goers astray. Else you may have to lament with Falstaff, Company, villanous company has ruined me, Hal!

I have been lately in correspondence with W^m J. Duane: seeing as how I have very little to do, I take great interest in S. Girard's will and his College, which I greatly fear the Black-coats will contrive by some rascally scheme or other to defeat. You have heard, I suppose, that the

¹ See *House Report* No. 244, Twenty-second Congress, first session, by W. R. Davis of South Carolina.

battle rages furiously between the Ch[urch mili]tant and your humble servant, even to extermination. Bellum [internec]inum. I am not yet conquered, and expect yet to bivouac on the field of Battle. I have no objection to a moral governor of the universe, but how came he in that character to create the Priesthood? Moral! You might as well apply squareness to virtue. I wish I knew how to account for moral and physical evil, and then I should be able to account for malaria, dyspepsia, yellow fever, the plague, cholera, rattlesnakes, mosquitoes and faquirs of all classes and orders, asiatic and european, papist and protestant. Can you tell me for what good purpose that man of the milk of human kindness, John Calvin, was ordered into the world, the counterpart of Ignatius Loyola? Hands off: that's my trick if you please, as the devil said of the dead presbyterian! Thank heaven, when I depart from these gentry in this world, there is no chance of our meeting again in another; else I sh^d have to exclaim tantæne animis celestibus iræ!

I did not send you my "Layman's letter to any Member of Congress" because like other great characters, I thought proper to travel incognito: but I was it seems like the Ostrich, that wise bird that hides its little head in the sand, and being unable to see anything itself, thinks its great backside invisible to all the world. I shall republish my defence,¹ with the Layman's letter annexed for the benefit of all pious presbyterians like General Blair.² Shall I send you a copy? I hope you are not bitten by the black ants: I'm sure not. You are not a man to attend Baptist-immersions at Christmas, or protracted revivals in July. But I vow to heaven, that now a days I do not know who is who; and metaphysician as I am, I do not believe I can tell whats what, Hudibras notwithstanding. When I see a vinegar scowle under the flapped hat of a solemn looking man in black, I cannot for the soul of me associate any thing kindly with it. Do you remember the whites of Ashbel Green's³ eyes when he prayed to half a dozen members of Congress in the early days of our democracy, under good old Stephen Thompson Mason,⁴ whose memory I reverence yet. no: I cannot believe that you fraternize either with yankee politicians or with piety pretending saints. Thank God the new Yorkers are going to turn their Chaplains adrift: they have begun with Parson Wilson for telling truth, and they will go on with the rest for telling lies.

However, à nos moutons: to our business.

My son in law Manners, I hear, is at Washington, under a rolling stone propensity that has impelled him thither. He wants to quit the woods and practice in a city. He is weary of keeping company and holding

¹ *The Case of Thomas Cooper, M.D., President of the South Carolina College, submitted to the Legislature and People of South Carolina*, Columbia, 1832.

² The allusion is to a letter of Gen. James Blair of South Carolina, dated December 17, 1830, apropos of Cooper's *Letter of a Layman*, in which he denounced Cooper as an infidel. The letter is printed in Niles's *Register*, XL. 145.

³ Chaplain of the senate, afterward president of Princeton College.

⁴ Stevens T. Mason, Senator from Virginia, 1795-1803.

soirées with Dryads and Hamadryads. As he is a perfect stranger at Washington (so my daughter tells me) he wants some kind of introduction that will give him the liberty of making inquiries for information. Do you know D^r Jones of the Franklin Journal [at] Washington? Pray introduce D^r Manners to him and to Warren D[avis]. I suspect Manners will call on you. Adieu my good friend,

My little Daughter just 12 plays Nina delightfully.

Adieu my good friend.

Yours truly

THOMAS COOPER.

2. *Letters on the Nullification Movement in South Carolina, 1830-1834.*

(First installment.)

THE following letters, illustrating in a variety of ways the nullification movement, have come into the managing editor's hands from various sources. Mr. Edward Spann Hammond of Blackville, S. C., son of Governor and Senator James H. Hammond, has kindly placed at the editor's disposal the letters which Governors Hamilton and Hayne addressed during the crisis to his father, then a young but influential lieutenant of their party, as well as copies of his replies, and a record of a conversation with Calhoun. He has also lent a valuable collection of contemporary pamphlets, which, combined with the considerable collection possessed by the library of Brown University, has helped greatly toward an understanding of the struggle. The letters to Hammond, it may be remarked, are during 1830 and 1831 addressed to him at Columbia; after that, to Silver Bluff or Silverton in Barnwell District. Next in importance are the letters of Hayne to another of his aides, Francis W. Pickens. For these we are indebted to Mrs. J. E. Bacon of Edgefield, daughter of Governor Pickens. The papers once possessed by Governors Hayne and Hamilton, including in the latter case his correspondence with John Randolph of Roanoke, have unhappily perished. General Edward McCrady of Charleston, president of the South Carolina Historical Society, has kindly furnished a copy of a letter from a Union committee, of which his father was a member, to one of the local supporters of that party. For the letters of President Jackson and of Bolling Hall to Nathaniel Macon, possessed by a descendant of Macon, Mrs. Walter K. Martin of Richmond, we are indebted to her and to Professor William E. Dodd of Randolph-Macon College.

It is not doubted that the letters will be thought to be interesting, and to afford a vivid notion of the character of the struggle and

the extent of the resistance planned (the unpreparedness of South Carolina in some respects is made manifest, but that of the United States must also be considered). But the series is too long for one issue of the REVIEW. For want of a better point of division, it has been divided by the date February 1, 1833, the date at which the Ordinance of Nullification was to go into effect. The remaining papers already collected, and perhaps some others, may be expected to appear in the October number.

The reader who wishes to see the same series of events from the point of view of the opposite party, may be referred to Dr. Joseph Johnson's narrative and the letters of Jackson, Huger and Drayton, printed in Stillé's memoir of Joel R. Poinsett, in the twelfth volume of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History*, and to Grayson's *Life of James Louis Petigru*. For the more general aspects of the struggle, see Houston's *Critical Study of Nullification in South Carolina*.

I. ROBERT Y. HAYNE¹ TO JAMES H. HAMMOND.

(*Private.*)

WASHINGTON, 25th Feb. 1830

Dear Sir.

I have rec^d your letter and will best manifest my friendly disposition towards your enterprise by answering it at once. [You]r objects are honorable, and of vital [im]portance, and you have my best [wis]hes for your success. I agree [wi]th you that our success in the [great?] struggle in which the South [is en]gaged, will in a great measure depend on the *firmness, steadiness, and [tem]per* of our proceedings. Everything [wh]ich looks like unnecessary violence [mu]st have the tendency to create reaction, and yet it is extremely difficult to keep up the public feeling at a proper point, and prevent its boiling over. Men who are suffering, and who are justly indignant at a violation of their rights, can hardly be expected to speak and act with due moderation. Be assured, that a perseverance in the course you indicate as approved of by *your own judgment*, will be attended by the happiest effects. If our friends at home could be induced to base their proceedings on the Virginia Resolutions of '98, I am confident they will carry with them the whole South, and a large portion of the people in other quar[ters]. acting on any other principle, [we] shall encounter difficulties at ev[ery] step. I shall be glad at all [times] to afford you all the informa[tion] in my power, on matters of public concern, and with my best wishes for your welfare am with great respect your

most ob^t Serv^t

ROB. Y. HAYNE.

James H. Hammond Esq.

¹ Hayne was at this time in the Senate. His great speech against Webster had been delivered a month before. Hammond was editing the *Southern Times* at Columbia.

II. ROBERT Y. HAYNE TO JAMES H. HAMMOND.

WASHINGTON, 29th March 1830.*Dear Sir.*

D^r. Cooper's letter has been well rec^d here. Its tone of moderation has secured it a favorable reception. I hope and trust he will be equally temperate in all his writings. We have nothing to gain from violence or shocking even the *prejudices* of the people at home or abroad. I do not think I have seen the true spirit better illustrated than in the short article in the Carolinian, which I send to you, in place of an exposition of my own ideas. I think with you that no attempt ought to be made to produce excitement among our Citizens. Let the sound doctrine be spread abroad, and let them see and feel the actual posture of our affairs. There are only two points on which I will venture to give you a hint. Our Presses at home ought to refuse to discuss in any way the question of the next Presidential Election. We have questions of our own entirely above that of whether A. or B. is to be our next President. We must not again mix up our complaints with mere party questions. We ought to keep aloof from everything calculated to divide our own citizens.

You ought to keep an eye to all the measures *looking to the distribution of the nat^l. funds*, whether by direct appropriation of money, or for Roads and Canals, Schools, Pension Bills, or in any other way,—and every decision in favor of such projects ought to be noticed and condemned. I write *in haste* and can only give you *hints*. I do so in compliance with your request, and have only to add that while I shall be happy to aid you with my advice, I wish of course that my suggestions should be considered as thrown out merely for *your consideration*, and intended merely for your own eye.

With great respect, yours

ROB. Y. HAYNE

J. H. Hammond Esq.

III. JAMES HAMILTON, JR.¹ TO JAMES H. HAMMOND.

CHARLESTON August 24 1830.

It has afforded me Dear Sir the sincerest satisfaction to receive your kind favor of the 21st which gave me the agreeable intelligence that my anxious wishes had been anticipated in a manner so satisfactory and honorable to both parties, through the good offices of the worthy and respectable gentlemen who acted as Mediators between Gen^l Blair and yourself. That his life has been spared for useful and honorable service to the State I sincerely hope, nor can I the less distrust the destiny for which your own has been reserved by the early and powerful exhibition which you have made of public spirit and Talent.²

¹ Major James Hamilton, jr., has been a member of Congress from 1823 to 1829, and was governor of South Carolina from December 1830 to December 1832.

² A pamphlet bearing the title *The Controversy between General James Blair and James H. Hammond, Esq.*, 1830, furnishes the explanation of this allusion. In a let-

I ought to observe to you that the seeming tardiness of my Letter resulted from a misapprehension of the time fixed for the Meeting between Gen^l Blair and yourself. It was reported here that the 28th was the day, which would have afforded ample time for my Letter to have reached its destination, and operated the purpose for which it was designed.

I will thank you to hand the enclosed to Mr. McMonnis, to the publisher of the S^o Times. It is the amount of my Subscription in advance for the *Country* paper. I take so many papers, and at present so many are sent to me, that I am constrained to consult the economy of time in reading them, by confining my subscription to those at a distance to the weekly papers. Your own fire is so spirited and well directed that I should be disappointed not to see the Times at least once a Week.

The effort of the federal cabal here to put the Collector of the Port ³ at the head of the Gov^t of our City will fail, I trust by such a rebuking majority on the side of the S^t right party, as will teach Uncle Sam's officers that it is as well for them to eat the bread he provides for them in quiet,—and to let the rest of the Community take care of the liberties and honor of the State.

With my best wishes for your happiness and prosperity, I remain, with much esteem, very respectfully

Your ob^t Svt.

J HAMILTON JR

J. H. Hammond, Esq^r

P. S. I must beg you to present my kind regards to Cap^t Butler. ¹ If I had known that he was to have acted as one of your friends I should of

ter to the *Camden Journal*, dated from Washington, May 30, Gen. Blair, a member of Congress from the district in which Camden was situated, expressed warm satisfaction over President Jackson's veto of the bill for the Maysville Turnpike Road, and declared that thus the system of internal improvements was completely thrown overboard, and that, with regard to the tariff, if South Carolina would exercise a little forbearance, all things would come right in a year or two more. Indignant at such moderation, Hammond commented sarcastically upon the letter in his paper, the *Southern Times*. Blair replied with a long letter of defense, ending with calling Hammond a blackguard. Thenceforward the affair went on in the regular course so well described by Touchstone in a well-known passage. Hammond's next article in the *Times* ended with the declaration that "as far as the freedom of the press is committed to us, we shall preserve it, professionally or otherwise, if the General will signify an inclination for it." Blair's next letter to the *Journal* concluded with the statement that he "held himself responsible to any gentleman that felt himself aggrieved by anything that he had written." Hammond sent him a challenge which was accepted, and a meeting was arranged for August 18. The night before, however, the friends of the two arranged a reconciliation. It was agreed that all offensive expressions should be withdrawn, that a personal encounter was unnecessary, and that an amicable adjustment would be honorable to both parties. The *Times* and the *Journal* published the formal pronouncement of the friends, and "the incident was closed."

¹ James R. Pringle, collector of the port of Charleston, was put forward by the Union party as candidate for the office of intendant (= mayor) of the city, and was elected in place of Henry L. Pinckney, editor of the *Charleston Mercury*, on September 6.

² Pierce M. Butler, Hammond's second, afterward killed at Churubusco.

course have directed myself to him, which long and agreeable acquaintance would have fully justified.

IV. JAMES HAMILTON, JR. TO JAMES H. HAMMOND.

CHARLESTON Jan^y 8 1831.¹

My Dear Sir.

On my arrival in the City a few Days since, I had the pleasure to receive your two favors.

The course which you have indicated of watching closely and exposing fully and boldly the proceedings of Congress in the Times appears to me to be eminently judicious, during the session of Congress. after the 4th March we can then begin to say something of our means of redress,—and what is left for S^c Carolina to do for herself.

I hope you have made a final arrangement with Mr. McMonnis and that he agrees to contribute \$500 for your editorial compensation. the remaining \$500 shall be raised in a manner the most delicate and respectful to your own feelings. Your services are of the last importance to the cause and let nothing separate you from the Times. I hope the Telescope will be merged in it, by Mr. McMonnis buying the former in, which will be the best mode now of taking it out of the hands of the enemy.

I am exceedingly gratified by your acceptance of the station in my personal Staff as one of my Aids. Do not get your Uniform until you see my general order which will be out next Month, which may make some slight alteration in the uniform. I have to leave the City today for a few Days. on my return we shall move on our State Rights association, and beat to quarters again

With great esteem, Dear Sir,

Very respectfully and truly Yours,

J HAMILTON Jr

To Col. Ja^s H. Hammond
Columbia.

P. S. I have deemed it best in order to stop any slanders of Hay's to remit Gen^l Hayne another fifty Dollars, to pay him, which compleats the \$250 which he was to have received under my contract with Gen^l Green.

VI. JAMES HAMILTON, JR. TO JAMES H. HAMMOND.

CHARLESTON Jan^y 10th 1831.

My Dear Sir

I am just on the eve of my departure from town for a few Days and have only a Moment to observe that I forgot in my last Letter to say that until the adjournment of Congress I think the publication of the Convention Debate may be postponed in the Times for the reasons you very properly indicate.² I would by all means bring out at the end of the

¹ Major Hamilton had become governor on December 9.

² The legislature of South Carolina, in the session which ended December 19, debated warmly the question of calling a convention, such as was actually convened in 1832. The constitution of the state required for such an act a two-thirds vote of both houses; this was not secured. The debate was printed in a pamphlet, Columbia, 1831.

Debate the names of the *yeas* and *nays* on *every resolution*, that we may know as Mr Webster says "*Who is who.*" My best wishes and esteem attend you

Yours very truly and respect^y

J HAMILTON JR

Col. J. H. Hammond.

VII. JAMES HAMILTON, JR. TO JAMES H. HAMMOND.

CHARLESTON, Feb^y 5th 1831.

My dear Sir:

Just as I was on the e've of my departure, indeed just about to get into my carriage, your favor reached me. On my return to town, which will be in ten days, I will answer you fully; in the mean time I think you had better advise Mr McMonnis not to incur any expense in regard to the Convention Debate without the guaranty of a sufficient subscription list. After the adjournment of Congress we shall organize our States Rights Association and I hope be able to do something for the press in the Country.

Things go on well at home and quite bad enough at Washington to justify both our opinions and principles.

The Mercury.¹ is still sluggish but when Congress wanes to its end we will put a little fire into its columns.

The Tone of the Times is excellent and it is just where it should be. Keep at the helm, keep cool, and take deliberate aim.

My Charleston review will not be before the 1st April. In ten days I shall issue my order for the uniform of my aids. until then do not procure yours and request the other gentlemen to suspend their preparations. My aids are invited to attend the grand Military Ball on the 3^d March. I hope we shall have the pleasure of seeing you.

I send you Judge Huger's Speech, which I have not had time to read.² I remain, My D^r Sir, with esteem

Very respectfully and truly

Yours,

J HAMILTON JR

Col. J H Hammond.

VIII. MEMORANDUM BY JAMES H. HAMMOND.³

COLUMBIA 18th March, 1831.

I called at 7 Oclock this morning, at Judge DeSaussure's to see Mr. Calhoun, the Vice President of the United States. He is on his way from Washington to his residence in Pendleton. On receiving notice of

¹ The *Charleston Mercury*.

² Daniel E. Huger, afterwards a senator of the United States, resigned his position as a judge in 1830 in order to represent St. Philip's and St. Michael's in the General Assembly and speak and act against nullification.

³ A fragment of a journal, written in a commonplace-book of Mr. Hammond's. Letters of Calhoun to him, dated January 15 and February 16, 1831, are printed in the *Correspondence of John C. Calhoun* (A.H.A. 1899, II.) pp. 280, 289.

his arrival in town, yesterday morning, I paid him a visit of civility, and my call this morning was in consequence of a wish wh. he expressed to have some private conversation with me. He was alone, and immediately entered freely into the discussion of the affairs of the Nation. He said that great changes had taken and were taking place now in the political elements and that the course of a few months would exhibit a situation of parties in the country as extraordinary, as it had been unexpected. Genl. Jackson he said was losing the confidence of the Republican party every where, and even Tennessee had to a man sustained him (Mr. C) in the late rupture wh. had taken place between himself and the General. Kentucky was with him,—so was Pennsylvania, and Virginia with the exception of Stevenson and Archer. In fact three fourths of the members of Congress were with him ag^t the President. That he (Gen. J) had deserted all his political positions; he had first intimated he would not be a candidate for re-election, and now was: that he would not appoint members of Congress to office and had done so continually, and in short was as jealous of his military fame, as ever was Othello of his wife and easily played upon with it, by the cunning men by whom he is surrounded. For these reasons he thought confidence of the Republican party in General Jackson very much diminished; and for himself, he had dissolved all ties, political or otherwise, with him and forever. He did not think him as sincere a man, as he once did. With regard to the opposition, Mr. Calhoun thought he could discern a crack in that party also. The Tariff-men were beginning to believe that to push their policy any further would be a desperate movement, that would in all probability destroy the whole of it, and therefore the most reflecting among them were not disposed to support Henry Clay, for fear of his going too far with the system. Mr Webster he thought the only very prominent man thoroughly in favor of Mr Clay. The members from Kentucky had gone home resolved to push the election *against* Clay, tho' not in favor of Jackson. Should they succeed Mr. Clay was gone, and his partizans hating Genl Jackson and Mr Van Buren as they did, would unite upon any man to put him out. They would even take him (Mr. C.) with nullification on his head. (Judge Martin¹ was in the room and heard this expression also). In this state of affairs he thought best for the South to stand uncommitted on the Presidential question and to rally and concentrate her strength in pushing the principles for which she had been of late contending. He then spoke of the three great interests of the Nation, The North, the South and the West. They had been struggling in a fierce war with each other and he thought the period was approaching that was to determine whether they could be reconciled or not so as to perpetuate the Union. He was of opinion that they could. The interest of the North was a manufacturing and protecting one, that of the South Free Trade, and that of the West was involved in the distribution of the lands and Internal Improvements.

¹ William D. Martin, whose term as member of Congress had just expired.

How were they to be reconciled? The West must have some visible appropriations to counterbalance those for the improvement of the Harbours, fortifications &c of the Atlantic States, of which they were exceedingly jealous. And in the distribution of every acre of the public land they felt a deep solicitude. *He would therefore gratify them with a system of internal Improvements.* And here he spoke fully and freely of his opinions on this subject. He said he had always doubted of the Constitutionality of Internal Improvements and that in all his Reports and Speeches on the subject, he had never once committed himself on the Constitutional ground. That he had refused to do so in his Bonus Bill Report, against the wishes both of Clay and Lowndes, telling them that he had his doubts. That he thought he had made that Report in the strictest conformity with the wishes of the President, and was completely thunderstruck when Mr. Madison placed his Veto on it. He told him that if any the slightest hint had been given that neither he nor the administration would have been embarrassed by it. Mr. Madison did it to please Mr. Jefferson! Mr. Calhoun said he had been immediately transferred from Congress to the War Department and had never had an opportunity of vindicating himself from the various charges made upon him on this score wh. he felt himself prepared to do most triumphantly whenever called upon in such a manner that he could come out with propriety. Mr. Clay, he said, had seized upon In. Im. as a hobby and ridden it to death. Carried it much further than he ever intended to do and made it odious. In fact for the last five years, he said, he had seen that it would not do and had told his friends in Congress that the system, as carried on, must be arrested. Mr. Calhoun proposed to amend the Constitution for the purpose of making these In. Imp. and to make the public lands the great fund to be set apart for that purpose. He did not agree with Mr Hayne in his project of giving those lands away, wh. would at once unsettle the whole landed property of the U. S. Nor did he think as well of Mr. Webster's plan of doling them away by littles to the people, thus constituting them a great gambling fund, for corrupt speculations. The advantages to the South from this system would be very great. By connecting the channels of the West with those to the Atlantic it would bring the trade at once to its point, thro' the Southern States. He spoke of the Union of the Ohio and the Kenhawa wh. would make Virginia one state. Of the trade that would come to Charleston through the Saluda Gap wh. together with a rail-road from that city to Florence on the Tennessee river, and a canal thro' the cape of Florida would make it the great City of the South.¹ The Free Trade System was that of the South and thus would she reap the advantages. He did not dwell upon this latter proposition, but showed that in this manner the interests of the West and South might readily be reconciled. But how was the North to be prevailed on to give up the protecting system? Mr. Calhoun said that he was for direct taxation ulti-

¹ Many letters on the subject are printed in Calhoun's *Correspondence*.

mately, but at present he aimed only at reducing the Tariff down to the Revenue point—about Eleven or Twelve millions per annum, wh. would enable the government to pay the civil list handsomely. He said he was no radical in this and thought the government should be liberal in its constitutional expenditures. The Tariff at this point might be so adjusted as to suit the Northern people better than it did now. The general increase of duty on every article had diminished the profits of each individually by adding to the cost of every thing necessary to the production of each manufacturer. He would propose to single out some of the most important articles and giving them a liberal protection, enhance their profits still further by lowering the duties upon all [or] nearly all the other articles of necessary consumption. He said that the Northern manufacturers, if they took an extended view of things, must look to a foreign market and with that object it would be their desire and their most urgent interest, to cheapen everything in the country but their own peculiar manufactures. Taking this view of it, he thought the Northern people might easily be induced to lower the Tariff to the revenue point and thus reconcile the interests of the North and South. This is a pretty full view of Mr. Calhoun's plan of reconciliation. He thought it practicable—at all events worth trying. If it failed or matters continued going forward as they now did he looked upon disunion as inevitable. And he thought it best, for the system of plunder such as it was now was the most despicable of all possible forms of government. For his part he would not administer the government as it was now operating. He regarded it as a despicable ambition. It would be administering an insolvent estate,—and one, said Judge Martin who had entered the room during our conversation, that would soon have to plead "*plene administravit.*" If things could be fixed upon the basis he proposed the government would be strengthened, and regain the confidence of the people. It would prevent the traffic of interests now carried on. In this game the North could beat us. We being the payer and they the receiver they could outbid us with the West and always w^d do it. When I started to come away Mr Calhoun took his hat, and we walked together for some distance. He then hinted pretty strongly that if things went right, he might be placed in nomination for the Presidency next fall. I told him candidly that such a step would be imprudent at this moment both at home and abroad, and should not be thought of at this time. He agreed with me. He said his object was to throw himself entirely upon the South and if possible to be more Southern if possible. In advancing our principles therefore, we should advance him in the only way in wh. he desired to be advanced.

This I believe is a correct outline of the long interesting interview wh. I had with Mr. Calhoun. To many of his projects I could not yield my assent, and his fine theory—if sound and republican—I fear will be found impracticable.

—I dined with Mr. Calhoun to-day at Judge D's and took tea with him at Major Taylor's. He is much less disposed to harangue than usual.

There is a listlessness about him wh. shows that his mind is deeply engaged and no doubt that it is on the subject of the Presidency. He is unquestionably quite feverish under the present excitement, and his hopes.

IX. JAMES HAMILTON, JR. TO JAMES H. HAMMOND.

CHARLESTON May 3^d 1831.

My Dear Sir.

I have had the pleasure by yesterdays Mail to receive your kind favor, and regret that a pressure of business official and otherwise prevents my doing any thing more at present but to acknowledge its receipt.

I had previously been made acquainted by your Letter addressed to me at Columbia at the happy change of auspices which in all probability will keep you in Carolina for a Career I trust of exceptional prosperity and honor. Let me add my most fervent wishes that *yours* may in *all respects* be realized.

I am just preparing for my review tomorrow, and for my departure from the City to attend on the 6th for the same purpose at Strawberry. On my return to town I hope to meet McDuffie and after a full consultation with our friends here we will write you precisely what tone it is deemed most advisable to give to the press. I am fully aware of the great peril of permitting public feeling to collapse because the inference made is that the cause is not worth supporting or the party unworthy of supporting it. We must have a rally on some firm ground and then stand manfully to our arms. The administration at Washington cannot recover from the retreat *precipitate* of the late Cabinet, and consequently Jackson's reelection is placed in such hazard as scarcely to be a probable event. We had better lay too, as the Sailors say, with our Main top sail aback and see our way well ahead before we make sail. In truth it becomes of vast importance to know the true character to be given to this change, whether it is in fact a countermarch from fear or from a profound spirit of intrigue. I would suggest silence on the subject of the new Cabinet until from Hayne, Mc Duffie, and my own knowledge of the individuals we can give you a true Key to the whole movement. Expect to hear from me soon and be assured in the mean time of the sincere esteem and regard with which I am

faithfully and respectfully

Your friend

J. HAMILTON JR.

X. JAMES HAMILTON, JR. TO JAMES H. HAMMOND.

CHARLESTON May 21st 1831.

My Dear Sir.

I have had the pleasure to receive by last evening's Mail your favor of the 16th inst.

Whilst I deeply regret that we must lose your valuable services at the Head of the Times, I am greatly rejoiced that this retirement from your

Post is the result of such a felicitous Cause ; on this event allow me to tender you my heartfelt congratulations. If it were practicable for me to leave Charleston in June, nothing could afford me greater pleasure than to be present at your marriage, but public and private engagements forbid my entertaining such an anticipation.

I trust your retirement however from the Times will be only a short pause in the Career of your public usefulness, and that we shall have you in some even more distinguished and important Station in our party. We shall at least know for any purpose of high service and generous devotion where we have a Man on whom we can rely. You must however as soon after your "Honey Moon" as possible beat to quarters again, as we must make this Summer tell by the efficiency of our efforts in the common cause.

Mr Duffie received a public dinner on Thursday at the hands of our party, and made a superb and gigantic effort which has struck a damp in the hearts of our opponent[s]. He is staying with me and preparing it carefully and elaborately for publication.¹ We shall have it extensively circulated in a pamphlet form throughout the South. In the excellence of the *tact* which he displayed in adapting his speech to the crisis and the community in which it was delivered, he was almost seemingly inspired. In the course of a fortnight we shall move on our State rights associations and not only attempt to make "Nullification easy" but successful too. I shall be at all times gratified to hear from you and never more than when you tell me that you are prosperous and happy. Believe me, My Dear Sir, ever with esteem

Respect^l and faithfully yours,

J. HAMILTON JR.

Col. Hammond.

XI. JAMES HAMILTON, JR. TO JAMES H. HAMMOND.

CHARLESTON JUNE 11th 1831.

My Dear Sir.

I have received your kind favor detailing the particulars of your affair with Daniel. I assure you that they are well understood here, as well as the necessity under which you acted. The truth is that no Man who read Daniel's² editorial could have doubted for an instant what course you would have pursued, and I sincerely rejoice that your escape from his pistol has been as signal as the gallantry with which you advanced to its Mouth. I think this incident will put a curb upon him, and that he will see the propriety of maintaining a certain sort of decorum if not justice to our party.

I have seen with great regret the course which Green³ is pursuing towards us and Mr. Calhoun. He will ruin the latter if he is not checked.

¹ *Speech at the Public Dinner, May 19, Charleston, 1831.*

² Editor of the *Telescope*, Union Organ.

³ Duff Green, editor of the *United States Telegraph*.

Green has certainly got into his head, I hope without Mr. C.'s sanction, that by compromising with the Manufacturers that he can be elected. Indeed Green has written me a long Epistle on the subject, holding out the most alluring probabilities of Mr. Calhoun's success and of the willingness of the Manufacturers to compromise with us on the principle of his Speech in 1816. I have replied very explicitly to him that in no shape lot or scot would we be included in the arrangement, that we would take no part in the presidential election and that I was quite sure that Mr. C.'s prospects were as hopeless as his ruin would be certain if he was brought to give his countenance to such a compact. He also civilly asked if we were all crazy at Mr. Duffie's dinner, if we intended to start into open rebellion and insure the empire of the whore of Washington (Mr. E.¹ I suppose). to these civil things my Reply was brief and explicit—That whether we decreed perpetual empire to the W—— of Washington or not, or started into rebellion, we should go on and abate not one jot of our Zeal in the support of our principles, which we would sacrifice to the elevation of no Man on earth. That as for surrendering Nullification, which he kindly recommended, that that this was as impossible as his proposed league between the Nullifiers and the Manufacturers which in itself was as practicable as a confederation between the Poles and the Cossacks. I have no doubt he moves in this matter with Calhoun's sanction. Mr. C. has too much sense not to see the essential Weakness of his occupying a double position, Janus faced, with one expression of countenance for one side of the Potomac and another expression for the other.—I am happy to hear that your nuptials are so near at hand. Wishing you all manner of happiness and that I may hear very often from you during your journey I remain, My Dear Sir, very respectfully and faithfully

Yours,

J. HAMILTON JR.

P.S. Pray obtain the best information you can of the State of public sentiment in the interior. Pray say to Dr. Davis and Dr. Cooper that I will write them in the course of the next week.

P.S. I enclosed Mr. Calhoun copies of Green's Letters to me and my Letter in reply, in order that he might see the whole ground. If Green continues this course we shall have to be even more explicit than we have been in the short editorial which Pinckney put forth a few Days since.

XII. ROBERT Y. HAYNE TO JAMES H. HAMMOND.

WASHINGTON, 29th Dec^r 1831.

Dear Sir.

I received your letter in due course of mail and have delayed my answer until I could see the Secretary of War. I have just returned from his house, and have got him to make a memorandum of my cordial concurrence in your brother's² recommendation for a Cadet's warrant.

¹ Eaton.

² Marcus C. M. Hammond, West Point 1836, afterward major-general of Georgia militia.

If my voice can have any weight in the case, the course I have pursued will secure its utmost influence. I cannot say, however, what chance your brother may stand, as this will depend upon a variety of considerations.

The course of our Legislature was on the whole a prudent one, and the nomination question was disposed of admirably. Every thing is in confusion here but all hopes of an adjustment of the tariff on *sound revenue principles* are fast melting away. Both parties are in truth looking only to an arrangement, which shall not impair the *protecting system* and the true game now is to secure the manufacturing interest, while the South is to be beguiled. Let our friends therefore keep their eyes wide open. Denounce all *partial arrangements* as worse than nothing, and if we can do no more, we will maintain our moral strength at home.

I have only time to add that I am
very truly yours

ROB. Y. HAYNE

J. H. Hammond Esq.

XIII. JAMES HAMILTON, JR. TO JAMES H. HAMMOND.¹

RICE HOPE Savannah
River Jan^y 16th 1832.

I was exceedingly mortified, my Dear Sir, on my return to my House at dark to find your Note. if it had been earlier received I should have sent my Boat off at once for you under the hope that M^{rs}. Hammond could have given you leave to pass the evening with me in my solitary Box in the Swamp. Nothing would have gratified me more than to have had a long conversation with you over a Cup of Coffee and a good fire and nothing I assure you shall prevent my visiting you at Silver Bluff on my return from Pendleton but some overruling or unavoidable accident as I desire much to see you before the meeting of our Convention, which I believe will be one of the most important assemblies in its probable influence on public opinion and public measures that has ever convened in the State.² I have no doubt it will sketch the chart which we are to Steer by after the adjournment of Congress. The Committee on Manufactures will report in favor of an excess of Revenue over and above the necessary wants of Government of 5 Millions for internal improvements and Mr. McLane's other projects which I trust will arouse poor old dyeing Virginia.

We must push on vigorously towards Spring and have the people prepared not only to detect the fraud of a deceptive adjustment of the tariff

¹ Addressed: "Col. James H. Hammond (of S. C.) At Mrs. Maxwell's, Savannah."

² The allusion is to a convention of delegates from all the state rights and free trade associations in the state, which assembled at Charleston, February 22, 1832, and over which Governor Hamilton presided. See Houston, *Nullification in South Carolina*, p. 105.

but to resist it too—which I think with prudence moderation candor and firmness we may accomplish. We must not however now push matters to anything like an extremity.

I shall leave this to-morrow Morning for the pilings and shall return in the trip after the next in the John D. Mangin. I shall with this view be at Hamburg on my way back to take the Boat on Thursday the 2^d of Feb^r and I hope to have the pleasure of being at Silver Bluff on Friday the 3^d by noon that I may pass that day with you and on Saturday take the Boat at the Bluff. You need not make any arrangement about sending horses for me to Hamburg, as I shall have my Carriage there having dispatched it from Charleston to meet me on Wednesday at the former place.

I am not surprised at our South Country as Mr Macon calls it being infested with the Missionaries of whom you speak. It is nothing to what we shall see if we do not stand manfully at the Safety valve of Nullification, or to use a more euphonious term, State interposition. In conclusion, My Dear Sir, I am almost inclined to quarrel with you for not coming over this afternoon with my servant who was in town and would have shown you the way. Do me the favor to make my best respects to Mr^s. Hammond and be assured of the invariable regard and esteem with which

I am Faithfully yours,

J. HAMILTON, JR.

P. S. I need scarcely say that I write this on the possible contingency of not meeting you at the Steam Boat to-morrow at the Pilings.

XIV. CIRCULAR OF THE UNION PARTY'S COMMITTEE OF CORRESPONDENCE
FOR CHARLESTON.

(*Confidential.*)

CHARLESTON, November 2, 1832.¹

Mr. Joshua Teague,
Milton, Laurens, S. C.

Sir: Besides the reasons publicly given by the central committee of our party here,² we are instructed by them to communicate to you less publicly, and through you to our party in your district, some other considerations which have determined their course.

The doubtful character of the Convention about to be organized is a strong reason why we should not permit our leaders to take part in its deliberations. It is certainly doubtful, if nothing more, whether such a Convention will represent the supreme sovereignty of the State; for besides the objections so well urged in our published communication, (that the representation is the same as that of the Legislature, and thus makes our very slaves elements in the composition of the sovereignty of our

¹ The legislature had on October 26 passed (by 31 votes to 13 in the Senate, 96 to 25 in the House) the act for calling a convention of the state. The elections were to be held on November 12 and 13; the convention was to assemble on November 19.

² See extracts from their address, in Niles's *Register*, XLIII. 175.

State) this Convention is restricted in its action and limited in its duration, when it is obvious that sovereign power must be above all legislation. Even the body which calls this Convention into existence has had its powers called in question, and the able arguments which have appeared against it have convinced many that that body was not constitutionally the Legislature of our State. Should we not then reserve ourselves for every objection which can be made to the legitimacy of this Convention for the day of reckoning and account, when the people shall have recovered from the intoxication of the present excitement and return to their usual sobriety? But if delegates of our party take their seats in that body will they not commit the party to abide by its decrees and support its character? At all events they will add to it all the weight and influence which those delegates will possess as men high in the confidence and esteem of their own party.

Again, by keeping aloof and avoiding party contests for the present, we withdraw that external pressure which is the only power capable of binding and uniting a party harmoniously together and expose our adversaries inevitably to dissensions and contentions, which have never failed in the history of the world to divide triumphant parties and break them in pieces. While party is arrayed against party, the most aspiring can be controlled by the danger of defeat. But when power and office are entirely within the gift of one party, the ambitious, no longer fearing a common enemy, will certainly contend for them among themselves.

In addition to all this we would urge that if the Nullifiers eventually fail and the Union is preserved, the mere fact of having held a seat in that body will be a reproach always requiring explanation; for then, like the Hartford Convention, it will consign its members to an odious fame.

This much we are instructed to say to you privately, in vindication of the course pursued by our party in the parishes, to be communicated to such as you choose, particularly the influential, but not to be published. We are also instructed to suggest that even if you find it necessary to run a ticket for delegates to the Convention in order to maintain our superiority in your district, whether it would not be best for the delegates when elected to refuse to take their seats and thus keep your district altogether unrepresented. This course would be a sufficient cooperation with us here, without yielding the contest in the districts where we are strongest, and possibly might be best; but should your delegates take their seats in the Convention we fear a fatal breach will be made in the ranks of our party. The Nullifiers are already felicitating themselves upon a division in our ranks. It remains for you to decide whether you will blast their hopes or confirm their anticipations. With respect, gentlemen, we remain your obedient servants,

EDWARD MCCRADY,¹

RICHARD YEADON, Jr.

JOHN PHILLIPS,

Committee of Correspondence for the Parishes of St. ———.

¹ A nephew of Justice William Johnson of the United States Supreme Court. From 1844 to 1850 he was United States district attorney for the district of South Carolina.

XV. JAMES H. HAMMOND TO ROBERT Y. HAYNE.¹

SILVER BLUFF 20 Dec. 1832.

Dear Sir.

Gen Jackson's extraordinary proclamation has just reached me. It is the black Cockade Federalism of '98 revived fearfully invigorated by its long sleep, and seems destined to bring about another reign of terror. Based as it is upon the notoriously false assumption that S Carolina intends to resist the laws [and] Congress with the bayonet, the spirit of it, to every intelligent mind, is as ridiculous, as its arguments are absurd. But there is so much ignorance and passion in the country that both are dangerous, at this crisis, and must be met, promptly firmly and *efficiently*. To aid this purpose permit me to tender you my services in any way that you can make them most useful. I do not seek from you any post of distinction, not only because I can have no claims to it, but because at this moment every man must do his duty to his country without reference to himself. I will undertake any service you desire, and repair at an instants warning to any point, and for any purpose you will designate. I shall immediately set about arranging my private affairs for taking the field at an early day, not to quit it until all is settled. In this part of the country the people are very ignorant and have been heretofore rather inclined to the Union party, but if you think I can be best employed in recruiting Volunteers I will set about raising a company as soon as I receive your instructions as to the time and place [you] will want them and whether you can furnish arms &c and will endeavour to have them ready for service in due time. I have however no choice of employment, so far as I am concerned.

It is impossible to estimate the effect of Gen Jackson's proclamation. Upon the timid and ignorant of our party I fear it will have great influence, which it will require much caution to counteract. If I might be permitted respectfully and with great deference to make a suggestion to you, it would be that you should answer it officially. A similar proclamation from you would command the attention of the Union, and a calm exposition of the false and dangerous positions of the President so entirely subversive of every feature of republican government—a dignified rebuke of its prejudice and passion, and a firm defiance of its threats would have a wonderful effect on the American people. I think his rash denunciation and reckless and arbitrary doctrines afford the means of prostrating him if used with skill. If there is any purity left in our people or our institutions they will react under his monstrous usurpations. If there is none the sooner a general crush is effected the better. I can scarcely persuade myself that Gen Jackson yet intends to do any thing he appears to threaten, but that his alleged position of *defence*, and his insinuated want of *vested* power have been cunningly referred to that he may effect a retreat under their cover. And that after all he intends

¹ Hayne had just been chosen governor. The ordinance for nullification had been passed on November 24.

to make congress repeal the law while he to save appearances is making such violent demonstrations of his intention to enforce it. Whether there be any truth in this conjecture or not is not material to our course. I take it for granted that you will concentrate a large force in Charleston to meet this emergency. Permit me again with much humility to suggest that that concentration be effected silently and without parade. We have already done enough to alarm the more timid of our friends and to afford apparent grounds of justification for the mad councils of the President. At the same time care should be taken to have the force strong enough to annihilate instantaneously the first show of resistance to our laws, and give to treason as well as tyranny so signal and severe a rebuke that they will not recover from it soon.

I shall await with impatience your commands wh. will reach me through the Augusta Post office. In the meantime with the deepest interest in the success of all your measures and the highest respect and esteem for yourself

I remain

Your excellency's obedient servant

JAMES H. HAMMOND.

XVI. ROBERT Y. HAYNE TO FRANCIS W. PICKENS.

COLUMBIA 21st Dec^r 1832

Sir

I enclose you a Commission as my Aid-de Camp.¹ Full instructions will be hereafter forwarded. In the meantime you will be charged with the duty of raising, inspecting, and granting Commissions to Volunteer Companies, for which purpose General Orders are enclosed, and blank Commissions furnished. Report to me at the earliest day, with full information directed to Charleston.

Respectfully Your Obt Servt

ROBT Y. HAYNE.

P. S. You will take the Oath Yourself and suggest that it is also to be taken by the Officers of the Volunteers to be raised before any superior officer.

Addressed: "Public Service

"Francis W. Pickens Esq., Edgefield C H., S. C."

XVII. ROBERT Y. HAYNE TO FRANCIS W. PICKENS.²

Confidential.

CHARLESTON, 26th December, 1832.

Sir,

I forwarded to you, a few days since, your Commission as Aid-de-Camp, with a brief statement of some of the duties which would be imposed upon you. I propose now to enter into further explanations. I

¹ Twenty-eight aides were appointed this day. Niles, XLIII. 318.

² From a printed confidential circular.

will begin by stating my entire confidence that, at this crisis in our affairs, *when everything dear to our country is at stake*, you will enter upon the duties I have assigned you with a zeal, and energy, and devotion to the cause, which will incline you without hesitation to sacrifice all private considerations to the public good. Relying on this spirit, I will proceed to unfold to you my views, with the remark that they are intended only for your own guidance, and are to be no further disclosed than may be necessary to enable you to carry them into effect. I propose to secure the services of a Volunteer force, which I hope will not fall short of 10,000 men; no part of which, however, will be called into service until an emergency shall arise which may render this necessary. In that event, I shall take care that an equal portion of duty shall fall upon the militia which may not volunteer. I wish you to exert yourself *personally* and through others, to have volunteer companies formed, and to induce those already existing to volunteer in as large numbers and as promptly as possible. When convenient, you will personally inspect these companies, and in every case transmit to me, directed to "the Assistant Adjutant and Inspector General in Charleston," a list of the Officers and the number of the men, with a general statement of the arms at their command. To these Volunteer Corps, you may say in my name, that measures have been taken to procure an ample supply of Arms of every description, and that so soon as this can be effected, they shall be provided; in the mean time they will be paraded with such as they may be able to command. To the Cavalry you may say, that I am in hopes in a very short time to forward a supply of Sabres and Pistols, and you will inform me of the number wanted, and to whom they shall be forwarded. I wish you to furnish a copy of the "*Circular*" lately sent you, to each Colonel, and to such other Officers as you may think necessary, so as to make all the Militia Officers in your District acquainted with the fact, that you are the appointed Agent of the Executive, charged in that District with the transaction of all military business. Where you want assistance you will call upon the Staff Officers already in Commission, within your District, and should further aid be necessary send me the names of proper persons to be appointed.

Inform every Colonel, in writing, that he will be furnished with fifty copies of the "Abstract for the Manœuvres of Infantry and Riflemen" adopted by the Legislature at their last session; on applying in person or by written order to the Secretary of State in Columbia or Charleston, to be given out *in the first instance to the Volunteer Corps*, and the surplus to the rest of the Militia. A full supply of books will soon be obtained however, and every officer of Infantry, Cavalry and Artillery, will be furnished with them. The Cavalry will in like manner be furnished with "Hoyt's Tactics" on application. All demands for any purpose made through you will be promptly attended to by me, and if you want a supply of Books for *distribution* they will be furnished.

Having made these general explanations of your duties, I now proceed to a matter of THE MOST IMPORTANT NATURE, and if you are able,

by any efforts, *promptly* to carry my views in relation to it into full effect, you will not only secure my approbation, but entitle yourself to the lasting gratitude of the country. The VOLUNTEER CORPS above alluded to are intended to be called out by Companies, Battalions or Regiments, but a sudden emergency may arise when men may be wanted at a given point before such Corps can be prepared and marched to it. I deem it indispensable therefore, that a body of *Mounted Minute Men* should be always prepared to proceed in the shortest time possible to any place which may be designated, to be kept on duty for a few days or a few weeks, until more regularly organized Corps shall be brought into the field. My plan is this. Let a number of men, (every one of whom *keeps a horse*,) agree to repair at a moment's warning to any point which may be designated by the Governor in any emergency. Let them then come prepared with Guns or Rifles, or Arms of any description, with a supply of Powder and Ball, and come in the shortest time possible. If in each District only *one hundred* such men could be secured, we would have the means of throwing 2,500 of the *elite* of the whole State upon a given point in three or four days. And by no other means could this be effected. I wish you, therefore, to prepare a paper to the following effect, viz :

“We the subscribers, pledge ourselves *on honor*, to repair at a minute's warning, and without delay, to any point in the State which may be designated by the Governor, to perform any lawful service, in defence of the State, which may be required of us. For this purpose we will provide our own horses, arms and ammunition, and when assembled, we will arrange ourselves into a company, to be commanded by some officer chosen by ourselves, and to be called the Minute Men of Edgefield¹ District.” To persons who may sign such a paper, you may give the assurance that they will be called out only when necessary, that they will only be kept in the field until the regular volunteer Corps can be brought out, and that on their arrival at the point which may be designated, provisions and other supplies, and arms if necessary, will be furnished them. It would be preferred that they should serve without pay, as *partizans*, but this must not be stipulated for. Let it be distinctly understood, however, that a failure to appear at the point required, will be considered as a dereliction of duty, and will be attended by disgrace. To execute this plan, it may be well to select ten influential men in various parts of your District, to be called Leaders ; bring them fully into the scheme, and let each of them engage ten men as their quota. When the notice is given to you, that the minute men are wanted, you will instantly inform the Leaders and get them to extend the notice to their respective squads. Each man may then instantly proceed by *himself*, or otherwise to the place designated, with the assurance, that he will there find his comrades. Have one or more expresses always at your command, and bear in mind, that you will be held responsible for the speedy and certain extension and prompt execution of all orders. If you need assistance say so, for no

¹ A blank left in the print is supplied with the word Edgefield in manuscript.

excuse will be received for any failure, when your services are required. Remember that you fill one of the most responsible situations in the State, and it would be better to abandon it at once, than to fail in the slightest degree, to fulfil its vitally important duties.

I wish you to see personally each of the Colonels, and learn every thing relative to the general condition of the militia, within your District—the temper of the men—the state of their arms;—whether those out of order can be repaired in your neighbourhood—and what supplies exist of Field Pieces, Muskets, Rifles, Lead, &c, and generally every thing, which it is important for me to know ;—all of which may be embraced in a confidential Report.¹

Very respectfully yr ob^t S^r

ROB. Y. HAYNE

Col. F. W. Pickens.

P.S. The uniform of my staff will be the same as my Predecessor's except *under boots* and a *short yellow crane Plume*. Palmetto Buttons of a beautiful pattern may be had at Roche's, Charleston,² or of Col. P. M. Butler, Columbia.³

XVIII. JAMES H. HAMMOND TO ROBERT Y. HAYNE.

BARNWELL C. H. 8 January 1833

Sir.

I had the honor to receive a commission as your Aid-de-Camp bearing date the 21st Ult. accompanied by several copies of Your General Orders and Circulars, and your letter of instructions charging me with the duty of “raising inspecting and commissioning Volunteer Companies in this District.” I had also the honor subsequently to receive another letter of Instructions from you informing me more in detail of the duties you intended me to perform. Immediately on receiving your first communication I qualified myself to act by taking the prescribed oath and proceeded to distribute the circulars and General Orders throughout the district. An arrangement was made to have a general meeting of the citizens of Barnwell at the Court House yesterday and in the mean time I communicated by letter with the most influential men in the District. Yesterday the meeting took place and I am happy to inform you that on no occasion have I seen more enthusiasm and unanimity among the people. You will see in the papers the resolutions that were passed,⁴ and I assure you they breathe the true spirit of the occasion. I made every exertion in my power to stimulate the military spirit of the people and found but little difficulty in succeeding to an extent beyond my ex-

¹ What follows is in manuscript.

² An amusing tale respecting the palmetto buttons may be found in Niles's *Register*, XLIII. 146, and another in Josiah Quincy's *Figures of the Past*, p. 354; and perhaps they may be said to confirm each other. The former relates to a tailor designated as “R.,” presumably the Roche above mentioned.

³ Col. Pierce M. Butler, a bank president at Columbia, killed at Churubusco in 1847.

⁴ See Niles, XLIII. 397.

pectations. I am not yet able to give you a report that will be as full and satisfactory as I hope to present to you ere long, but will proceed to state generally the situation and temper of the District, as I suppose you wish to be put in possession of some data upon which you may calculate as speedily as possible the military strength of the State.

We have two Regiments in Barnwell, the 11th commanded by Col John Aaron, Lower 3 Runs P. O., and the 43 commanded by Col Jesse Rice. In the 11th one battalion is commanded by Lieut Col. Gasper I. Trotti and the other by Major James Furze. In the 43 one Battalion is commanded by Lieu^t Col Frederick Bamberg, the other at present has no commander, but an election has been ordered and will be held in a few days. These Officers are all warm and zealous supporters of the State, and eager to testify their patriotism by any service you may designate. The Battalion that has no commander has but one Union man in it. The beat companies in their respective Regiments and Battalions are all officered but two in the uncommanded Battalion and one in Col. Bamberg's and for these elections have been or will be immediately ordered. The men generally are as well equipped as the rest of the militia of the State, and from the best information I can collect at least three-fourths of them have guns. Their inferior officers in some cases are intelligent and active men, but most perhaps scarcely competent to command in active service. Neither are the superior officers what you would style Military men, but in case of necessity they will do very well to command until their places are better supplied. In the two Regiments there [are] at least twelve hundred fighting men independent of the Volunteer Corps. Of these there are four companies: Capt Johnsons Troop on Sav. Riv. [Savannah River] in the unofficered Battalion, composed of about Fifty men and in a flourishing condition. I am informed by the Captain that he is in want of a few swords and pistols which Col Hogg (to whose Regiment he belongs) has promised to procure; Cap^t Tindrels company of Riflemen in Col Trotti's Battalion, of which I can say nothing certain at present further than that it is regarded as a well appointed and finely disciplined corps and mostly Whigs; Capt Holden's company of Infantry in Col Bamberg's Battalion, not in a flourishing condition at this time and wanting in some equipments of which I will inform you more particularly at a future day; and Capt Touchstone's company of Infantry in the same Battalion of which I only know that they are nearly all Union men. Such is the condition of the militia of Barnwell so far as I have been able to learn it. The whole of the men are generally able bodied, more than two thirds staunch Whigs and to the honor of the District I am happy to state that should the militia be called out a considerable portion of the Union men will cheerfully march under the banners of the State.

In regard to the Volunteer's [movement] for this Crisis I cannot now report as fully as I shall be able to do in a few weeks. A company has been formed at this place, have chosen Officers and appointed a day to be inspected. A rifle company has been formed near Cannons Bridge on Edisto

chosen officers and appointed a day to be inspected. A Company of mounted riflemen has been formed near Matthew's Bluff, will choose officers on the 10th inst. and have appointed a day to be inspected. Cap Holdens Company will volunteer. Capt Johnsons will do the same and probably Capt Tindrells. Of the regular beat companies a number, though I cannot now say how many, will volunteer with their officers. I have requested the beat Captains wherever I have thought they would Volunteer to call their Companies to-gether and ascertain their wishes and report to me, between the 20 inst and the 1 of February. I shall myself attend several of their musters. A company is also forming which if it succeeds I shall take the liberty of presenting to your particular attention. It is to be called the Volunteer veterans and to embrace all the revolutionary remains of the district; No one will be admitted who is under Fifty years of age. At the head of this project are Old Col. Tarlton Brown, Genl Walker and Capt Trotti.

If it were not for the Troop and rifle companies I think I could promise to have organized for you by the middle of February an entire Regiment in this District. Excluding them we shall certainly have a Battalion well filled. I should be glad to know from you in what capacity you wish the rifle Corps to act, whether as infantry of the Battalion or as detached Corps, and particularly the mounted Riflemen. On this point please instruct me as early as possible as I have fixed on Saturday the 19th to inspect a rifle Corps and Monday the 21 to inspect the mounted riflemen. In this emergency, unless otherwise instructed, I shall not be rigid as to the uniform and equipments of the Volunteer Corps as it will be impossible for every man to be completely appointed on so short a notice. It is with this understanding that appointments for inspection have been made.

I have pursued your instructions in relation to the minute men and have in every case instructed the Leader of a squad to report to me by the 20 inst. I have every expectation that a company of one hundred men can be raised by that time, of which I will give due notice in my report to the Assistant Adjutant and Inspector General.

According to your directions I have informed the Colonels of the District that they can obtain the "Abstract of Manceuvres" upon application. If I had a dozen copies myself I could make an excellent use of them immediately. Major Dunbar, Commander of the Upper Squadron of Col Hogs regiment, has requested me to obtain for him twelve copies of "Hoyt's Cavalry." I promised him that they should be here next week and must beg you to direct them to be forwarded to "Major Francis F. Dunbar, Barnwell C. H." by the Stage. I have been applied to for several commissions and as I shall want a number myself I must also beg you to have forwarded to me at this place to the care of the Postmaster about three dozen or more if they can be spared.

If you have any instructions for me, they will reach me until the 17th at Augusta, on the 18th here and after that at Augusta again, and I have to request you, as I have occasionally to lay aside the military part of my

vocation and give the people my opinions of the political aspect of affairs, to be kind enough to drop me such hints as may enable me as far as possible to act in all things in harmony with your views.

With great respect

I am your Excellency's

Ob^t Servant

JAMES H. HAMMOND.

To His Excellency

Robert Y. Hayne

P. S. There is not a piece of mounted Ordnance in the District. There is said to be a old Cannon near the levels which was probably left there in the Revolution. I shall have it examined and tried and if worth mounting I will have it brought here.

XIX. ROBERT Y. HAYNE TO FRANCIS W. PICKENS.

CHARLESTON Jan. 11th 1833.

Sir

Some doubts having arisen as to the regulation of the *Mounted Minute Men*, I have to inform you that they will be considered as Volunteer Corps, and that they will be allowed to choose their own officers either when formed or when called into the field as may be preferred. They are to be *independent companies* divided into Squads or Divisions of ten, each squad having its leader, and arrangements must be made to ensure prompt Notice to each Member of the Corps in the event of a call for their services when they must instantly repair to the place appointed.

Respectfully Yours

ROB. Y. HAYNE

Col. Pickens.

P. S.

I have just rec^d your letter of the 9th. The Sabres and Pistols shall be granted you, but I can spare no more for the present. How shall they be sent? As to a Depot at Hamburg, on a small scale I should not object to it. Enquire on what terms it can be effected. Can you store powder and Arms and to what extent, and will it be *safe* from a sudden invasion? Can't Shultz mount a piece or two of Cannon at Hamburg? We have nothing very new here. We have had an Express from W.¹ but for what purpose no one out of the secret can conjecture. As to Volunteers from other States, I do not feel authorized to enroll them, but you may say if Carolina is compelled to fight in self defence, her brethren from other States would be hailed with delight.

In haste yrs truly

ROB. Y. HAYNE.

¹Washington. The relations of the federal administration with the Union party in South Carolina are shown in Dr. Stillé's article on Joel R. Poinsett in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History*, Vol. XII.

P. S.

Could you not *in time* make an arrangement with Col. Wardlaw for keeping a part of the 200 kegs of Powder which have been forwarded to J. P. and B. Benson at Hamburg at that place?

XX. JAMES H. HAMMOND TO ROBERT Y. HAYNE.

SILVER BLUFF 14th January 1833

Sir.

Your Orders in explanation of your Orders to recruit a Company of Mounted Minute Men reached me to-day. I am one of those who misapprehended your former orders and all of my subscription papers have been given out with erroneous explanations of your views. I thought, as it would be almost impossible to collect a body of men so scattered over the district, at the distance of thirty, forty, and even sixty miles apart, unless under the urgent circumstances of a call for immediate action, that you merely intended they should remain in their unorganized state until that call was made. I thought too that as you stated they were to be kept in the field only until the militia could come up, your object was to have in them nothing more than an advanced guard composed of the *élite* of the Volunteers who would fall back into their places as soon as their respective companies arrived; and I was further confirmed in this view by the reflection that you scarcely intended to establish on a permanent footing mounted corps of ununiformed men, promiscuously armed and without training. In giving out subscription papers therefore I stated that a person might be a minute man and also a member of a Volunteer Corps. The effort to form a Company of minute men upon any other system than this in so large a District as Barnwell will be attended with great difficulty; but I will endeavour to do it, though it will occasion much loss of time and in some places where the people are divided, prevent the formation of Volunteer companies. If it be not too inconsistent with your general plan I should be glad to be allowed to pursue the course I have marked out: as best suited to this District. I take the liberty of making this suggestion to your Excellency and in the mean time shall proceed to obey your Orders unless otherwise instructed at Barnwell where any communication will reach me on the 18th.

I have received your Orders to establish depots for provision. I have written to Col. Pickens to know his arrangements that I might make mine accordingly. Without waiting on him longer than I remain at home I shall while in the lower part of the district make one depot and soon after another above, of which you shall be duly advised. Your other instructions will be promptly obeyed.

With great respect

I am, your Excellency's

most Obedient Servant

JAMES H. HAMMOND

XXI. WM. E. HAYNE TO JAMES H. HAMMOND.

CHARLESTON Jan^y 14. 1833COL^o JAMES H. HAMMOND,*Dear Sir*

By the order of the Governor I have sent by the Stage, a Package addressed to yourself, to the care of Angus Patterson Esquire, Barnwell Court House, containing twelve Copies of the "Abstract of Military Tactics." Hoyt's Cavalry Tactics have already been furnished to Major Dunbar.

Very Respectfully

Your mo. ob. Serv^t

WM. ED. HAYNE

Aso^t. Adj. and Insp^r. Gen^l.

XXII. ROBERT Y. HAYNE TO JAMES H. HAMMOND.

CHARLESTON 18th Jan^y 1833.*Sir.*

My last letter on the subject of Minute men was induced by information that in some of the districts they had been so organized as to take *all the officers* and most of the efficient men of certain *Volunteer corps*, so as to leave the latter without the moral or physical force necessary to their efficiency. My scheme was in the main that which you have indicated,—the preparation of a select corps, composed of the elite of the several Districts who would on an emergency be thrown instantly on any given point,—the use to be made of them to depend upon circumstances. I was aware that such troops would not be the most efficient for long continued service, and therefore designed that the *number should be limited*, say to about 100 in each District, say 2800 in the whole State, which in an emergency would give us from 2000 to 2500 men, that could be instantly thrown upon a given point. I do not think this number of such troops would be too great. But it is upon the regularly organized volunteer corps that we would have to rely in any protracted warfare, and the object of my last letter was to impress upon you that these were not to be suffered to *be broken up*. The arrangements in the different districts, however, must be made in some degree to bend to local circumstances, and therefore you will consider yourself at liberty to pursue a sound discretion in this matter, provided only you secure not only the prompt attendance of 100 Minute men from Barnwell Dist. whenever called for, but take care that the efficiency of the other Volunteer Companies be not impaired. What I should desire would be as far as may be practicable to have 100 minute men composed of Gentlemen who keep horses, who would not in general probably be members of other Volunteer Infantry or Rifle Corps. As to Cavalry, they are or ought to be minute men from the nature of their employment. All the rest of the Militia I should be glad to see organized into Volunteer Corps. Should I want *instantly* 1000

men here, I would call on the Minute men,—if I wanted them *two weeks hence*, I should look principally to the other Volunteer Corps. I trust I have now explained my views, and must leave to your discretion the execution of them as far as may be expedient and practicable in your District. I shall be glad to have full Reports as soon as your organization is effected.

In haste respectfully yours,

ROB. Y. HAYNE.

Col. J. H. Hammond.

XXIII. JAMES H. HAMMOND TO ROBERT Y. HAYNE.

SILVER BLUFF 23rd January 1833.

Dear Sir.

On my return yesterday from an excursion through the lower part of the District I rec^d your last letter and some copies of your proclamation which I have distributed. I intended to write to you that it was impossible to make up my company of minute men without taking them from the Volunteer Corps. I am glad you have permitted me to adopt that plan; In anticipation of your objection to it I had from the first ordered that no Captain or 1st Lieu^t of a volunteer Company should join the minute men. I am sorry to say that I have not succeeded so well as I expected in that Corps. My first appointment of leaders have given me but about fifty men and a third of them are troopers. I hope to do better and *will* have them all by the time they will be required. The people of Barnwell are generally very poor, and though staunch yeomanry, not generally so public spirited I find as some of our neighbours. If drafted there is not a nullifier in the district and few Union men who would not cheerfully take up arms; and they would make soldiers that might be depended on; but as to volunteering they do not understand it and are not inclined to put themselves to unnecessary trouble. The fact is that there are not intelligent men enough sprinkled about to stir them up, and that they have gone right heretofore I attribute to mere instinct. Whenever they can be collected together I have never failed to produce some ardour among them, but in so large a district, so sparsely populated it is difficult to get them together, and they know so little of the matter that one exhortation does not last long. I mention these things to show you why there has not been as spontaneous a burst of patriotism here as elsewhere. We shall however form a Regim^t. Major Collins Battalion (a new and zealous Officer) will parade in a week or two and will I think unanimously volunteer. Two of the beats have already been absorbed by Volunteer Corps and the Cavalry. Besides this Battalion, three other Companies have been formed and two or three more will be. I have made it a point in this district to address the Union men whenever I find them and explain to them the true character of the *present question*. It opens the eyes of many who appear never to have had any light before on the subject. Few papers are taken and there have been few public discussions here.

In relation to the Depots, I have selected White Ponds for one and Buford's Bridge for another. But I take the liberty of suggesting to you that it would be better to have a depot near the rail road and take the troops down on it. If you think so, I will make a depot there instead of the one I contemplate at Buford's Bridge. I think I shall meet no difficulty in making the Conditional Contracts, provided I promise to give a week or ten-day's notice. I am expecting an answer from Mr Fatim at White Ponds to whom I have written on the subject. In regard to rifle-factories, there are none in Barnwell, but several in Lexington; but all on a very small scale. Mr. John Quateleburn near Leesville, Lexington, is one of the best rifle manufacturers in the Union, but he will charge \$11 for every barrel and it will cost \$5 more to have it stocked and locked in the [correct manner?] and if I am not mistaken it takes one workman a week to make a barrel—perhaps if pressed he might do it in half the time. The only plan I see for manufacturing rifles, if there is any, will be to establish a factory in Charleston, purchase iron &c and give so much for making each barrel. Twenty or thirty workmen might be collected in the State.

I have not had any regiments ordered out here, because I thought you might review them here this Spring and it would be a great inconvenience to the people to be called out twice. Besides there was no prospect of getting a regiment to Volunteer as a whole.

I have seen Gen. Erwin. He is decided, but not very warm. If you were to write him a letter it would flatter him very much, but he has little influence I think. I send you the Roster you desired as complete as I can make it now. Please note the changes in the address of the Colonels. I have just made a report to the Ass. Adj. and insp. Gen. to which I refer you for a statement of arms &c.

The message of Gen. Jackson reached me this afternoon. I have not had an opportunity to test its effect on public opinion, but presume it will have none. He appears to recede a little from his coercive doctrine, but he is not to be trusted a moment. It is evident that he will do every [thing] in his power. It is reported here that *he has* removed the Custom house to Castle Pinckney. Is not this a sweeping blow at the laws, treaties and Constitution? He is very *modest* in his request of powers from Congress. I wonder he did not recommend them to burn the Constitution and clothe him with supreme Authority at once.

Very respectfully

Your Excellency's

Mo^t Ob. Ser^t.

JAMES H HAMMOND

XXIV. JAMES H. HAMMOND TO WM. E. HAYNE.

SILVER BLUFF 23^d January 1833

Sir.

In Conformity with the instructions of the Commander-in-Chief I have the honor to report to you the state of military Organization in

Barnwell District so far as it has progressed under the General Orders of the 25 of December last.

On Friday last I inspected at Barnwell Court House Capt^t Schmidts company of Jefferson Volunteers. I inclose you a list of the names of the Officers and privates. You will perceive that there are forty eight of the latter and the non commissioned Officers who will require muskets, and I must request you to forward them to me by the rail road to the care of C. Dewitt Esq. near Edisto river. As there will probably be many names yet added to the list, if you forward any it would be as well to send seventy five stand. They will be wanted any how. This Company will have a fine uniform and is intended to be permanent. On Saturday I attended a muster of Cap^t M^cTyiere's rifle corps at Ford's Meadow on little Salt Catcher. Owing to accidental circumstances, the Company were not all warned and did not turn out in numbers sufficient to undergo inspection. There will be about sixty privates in this Corps and if you have arms to furnish I beg you to forward that many rifles to me at the same place as I shall inspect and Commission them in a few days. This Company will be well uniformed and permanent also. On Monday I inspected Cap^t Laffittes company of Riflemen near M^cCoy's bluff on Savannah River. I send you a list of their names and request you to forward arms for them, say sixty stand, to Matthew's Bluff, care of S. R. Cannon Esq. This company will be handsomely uniformed and probably permanent. There are other Volunteer Corps forming in the District of which I shall give you notice so soon as I inspect and commission them. I send you a list of Capt Johnson's Troop who Volunteered at their last muster. Col. Hogg was present and inspected them and will furnish you all necessary information respecting them.

Cap^t. Tindrells company of Riflemen mustered last Saturday and he was ordered to forward to me a full report of the state of their arms &c. wh. I am now expecting to receive. Cap^t Holden's Company also mustered at Buford's Bridge on Saturday. Of those present only four muskets were found out of repair. I think I shall be able to have them repaired here. The Company did not volunteer as a whole, but every individual signed a list which will be filled up in a few days. I ordered the muskets of the Old Company, sixty in number, to be collected at Buford's Bridge and will arm the new company with them. They are however of a very inferior quality. Of the General State of the arms in Barnwell I can inform you in few words. Besides the sixty muskets alluded to, Cap^t. Touchstone's Company have sixty more which I have not yet inspected and Cap^t Tindrell's sixty rifles of very inferior quality. These comprise all the public arms. Of the private I can only say, that as in every other part of the state, there is scarcely a man in Barnwell district who has not a rifle or Shotgun. The latter is in most common use here and little to be depended on in regular warfare. I have promised arms to all the Volunteers as soon as they can be procured and beg you will inform me as early as possible whether they can be obtained or not by letter to Barnwell C. H. I rec^d twelve copies of the "Abstract &c,"

but no commissions of which I am very much in want. Please send a copy of the bond which I must require upon delivery of the arms.

Very Respectfully

Your Ob^t Serv^t

JAMES H. HAMMOND

Col. W. E. Hayne

Ass. Adj. and insp. Gen.

XXV. WM. E. HAYNE TO JAMES H. HAMMOND.

ADJ. AND INSP. GENERAL'S OFFICE

CHARLESTON JAN. 28th 1833.

Sir

I herewith inclose you Twenty blank Commissions. Arms will be forwarded as soon as arrangements can be made for that purpose. Bonds required upon the delivery of Arms are now in press and you will be furnished with a supply as soon as printed.

Very Respectfully

Your ob. Serv^t

WM : ED : HAYNE

Ass^t Adj. and Insp. General.

Colonel James H. Hammond.

XXVI. ROBERT Y. HAYNE TO FRANCIS W. PICKENS.

CHARLESTON 31st Jan^r '33

Dear Sir,

Your *truly gratifying Report* has been rec^d. If you think you can keep them safely you may remove 300 muskets from the Abbeville arsenal to Edgefield C. H. also 3000 lbs. Lead. You may also have 100 kegs of Powder, which you may draw from the same place unless an advantageous purchase of that quantity can be made through some merchant in Hamburgh from Augusta. If 100 kegs of 25 lbs. each can be had at from \$5. to \$6, you may purchase that amount—if not draw them from Abbeville. I do not know that we can spare you a 9 Pounder for Hamburgh, but a piece of some sort can be furnished, and will be if you require it, and think it would be useful. As to the Armory, if a few workmen can be employed on reasonable terms to clean and repair arms, you may employ them, but you had better engage them by the month, and let me know the expense. The necessary repairs must be made, and a suitable person be employed to take charge of the Arms, but let our expenses be as small as possible. Any number of men who may meet at the Court House for drill may be furnished with arms, to be returned to the Arsenal when the drill is over. As to calling in Arms I do not *for the present* wish to do more than to get possession of those not in use, or which may need repair. *Private arms* we have nothing to do with, unless their owners choose to give them to us. I will enquire about the Standards for you, and will send you some copies of Hoyt as soon as I have an opportunity. If you know of any

person coming to town send him to me. As to funds,—orders may either be drawn on the Quarter Master General here, or if you prefer it, I will send you any amount you may require in an order on the Agent at Hamburgh, for which you may render an account hereafter. On this point let me know your wishes. May it not be worthy of enquiry whether Arms of some sort could not be picked up in Augusta. Get some Merchant to enquire. I annex the orders you require.

In haste y^{rs} truly

ROB. Y. HAYNE.

P. S. There is no objection at all to your taking com^d of the Reg^t. As to the encampment, it must not be *ordered*, and if by gen^l consent I think it had better not exceed one or two companies at a time.

(*To be continued.*)

3. *A Ministerial Crisis in France, 1876.*

IN 1873 France was passing through one of the most redoubtable crises of her domestic history. Thiers had succeeded in freeing French territory from the last consequences of the Prussian invasion and was enjoying the country's approbation when the Monarchist majority of the Assembly decided to reward his services by depriving him of the Presidency of the Republic. The unpopularity thus rashly incurred by the Monarchists was destined irretrievably to ruin their hopes.

On May 24, the Royalists managed to secure the election of Marshal de MacMahon as President of the Republic, and the Duc de Broglie became prime minister.

In November 1873 the National Assembly was called upon to discuss a bill, historically known as the "Septennial Bill," and designed to prolong Marshal de MacMahon's tenure of power for a period of seven years. During the debates M. Jules Simon spoke with a thrilling and fiery eloquence that surpassed all his previous oratory. He vehemently protested against conferring such powers on a man who personified no tradition and whose past could boast of no special glory, who had neither the prestige of the Comte de Chambord and the Comte de Paris, both of royal race, nor the genius of Napoleon. In spite of this impassioned protest, the prolongation of the Marshal's tenure of power was voted as a consequence of the failure of the Monarchist plans of amalgamation; and, after the elections of 1876, which were a definitive success for the Republican party, Marshal de MacMahon formed a cabinet with M. Dufaure as prime minister.

Nine months later, namely in December 1876, M. Dufaure's

ministry was defeated in the Senate over a Public Education Bill ; and M. de Marcère, who was Minister for the Interior, was compelled to withdraw from the cabinet, owing to an incident concerning the military honors to be paid to deceased members of the Legion of Honor.

Though M. Dufaure's ministerial stability was weakened by the vote of the Senate, the Marshal did not consider the matter important enough to warrant a government crisis. Being anxious to retain M. Dufaure in the cabinet, he thought it sufficient merely to arrange for the substitution of another minister for M. Marcère in the Interior Department. With this in view, on December 9, 1876, the President summoned a meeting of the cabinet for half-past nine in evening, at the Elysée. The only minister who was not invited was M. Dufaure, he being in the country for a rest.

I am able to publish for the first time the minutes of this cabinet meeting, which have great historic value as revealing Marshal de MacMahon in a light somewhat new and unexpected, at the same time that they add fresh information to what is already known of this episode in the parliamentary history of the Third Republic. These minutes were very accurately set down, and addressed to M. Jules Simon, by one of the most distinguished of the former ministers present at the meeting, who is now dead, but whose name I am not at liberty to reveal. The only survivor of those present is M. Christophle, now, as then, deputy. These minutes were dictated to the minister's wife, the original document, which I have seen, being in a feminine handwriting.

It is well known that this meeting resulted in a *statu quo* of the cabinet, save that M. Jules Simon replaced M. Dufaure as prime minister, taking also M. de Marcère's functions at the Interior Department, while M. Martel, who later became President of the Senate, succeeded M. Dufaure as Minister of Justice. The fall of this cabinet, six months later, precipitated by Marshal MacMahon's famous letter of May 16, addressed to M. Jules Simon, brought on the crisis of "the sixteenth of May," which came so near ending the Third Republic.

THEODORE STANTON.

ON December 9, 1876, Marshal MacMahon convoked a Council at the Elysée, at which were present: The Duc Decazes, Minister of Foreign Affairs ; Vice-Admiral Fourichon, Minister of Marine ; M. Teisserenc de Bort, Minister of Agriculture ; M. Léon Say, Minister of Finance ; M. Christophle, Minister of Public Works ; and M. Waddington, Minister of Public Instruction.

The Marshal began by reading a letter from M. Dufaure, the prime

minister, in which he stated that he was very much fatigued, that he could not come to Paris, and that he was disposed to give up the portfolio of the Minister for Public Worship, while keeping that of the Minister of Justice, and to offer the portfolio of the Minister for the Home Department to M. Jules Simon. After having read this letter, the Marshal asked the ministers present whether they would accept the combination. The Duc Decazes then proposed that there should be a private conference between the ministers before giving a reply to the Marshal, and M. Léon Say asked that the fullest explanations should take place in the presence of the President of the Republic. The Marshal then pointed out the situation in which he was placed. He said :—

“I am placed in a very difficult position. If the country declared itself against me, I would resign. I did not plot in order to get into power, and I make no point of honor in politics. But the majority of one of the Chambers is not the whole country, and I am doing my utmost to govern with the Left Centre. I have called to office the most important man.¹ There is only one of greater importance, namely M. Thiers. I could not nominate M. Thiers as minister. In such a case I could only myself withdraw. I am quite willing, however, to go further. I consent to proposals being made to M. Jules Simon. If anyone had told me, six months ago, that I should accept M. Simon as minister, it would have astonished me very much indeed.

“You may think perhaps that I am vexed with M. Simon on account of what he has said about me. That is a mistake. I should not have spoken of myself otherwise than as M. Jules Simon has spoken of me. He has said that I have not the prestige of the Count of Chambord, who is the representative of the royal line ; that is perfectly true. He has said that I have not the prestige of the Count of Paris who, after the Count of Chambord, represents the royal family ; also that I have not the prestige that Napoleon possessed by virtue of his genius. All this is perfectly true—I should have said exactly the same of myself. I have no spite against M. Jules Simon. But if you do not wish me to make proposals to him, what can I do ? I shall be compelled to issue a manifesto, announce to the country that the Left Centre is unwilling to remain in office, and that it is not pleased because I accept M. Simon. Then it will be quite natural to hold elections, when it will not be as it was with M. Buffet, who said very much, but who, in fact, did nothing to influence the elections. I think it will be necessary to act, and to act vigorously.

“I will not go further to the Left than M. Jules Simon. M. Gambetta has caused a ministerial list to be laid before me, with M. Duclerc as President of the Council, and M. Lepère, M. Leroyer, and M. de Freycinet as Ministers. There was also the name of M. Waddington. They would very much have liked to get rid of M. Léon Say, but they felt bound to retain him.

¹ M. Dufaure.

“This list was brought to me by General Borel, who knew Freycinet during the war. He felt that the latter was unjustly criticized. He was not a Napoleon, but he accomplished much. General Borel defended him before the Commission of Enquiry on the Conduct of the War. Later on, Freycinet, who was grateful to him, proposed to him that he should have him (Borel) named one of the seventy-five life-members of the Senate. But Borel, who belonged to the Right, did not wish to be in any way pledged to the Left. So as Borel did not wish to be on this ticket, another general had to be found. It was General Gresley, whom I like very much, and who is a very distinguished man.

“You understand that it is impossible for me to let my ministry be formed by Gambetta, and as M. Gambetta has proposed M. Duclerc, I shall not accept the Duclerc combination.

“There are, moreover, other reasons. I like M. Duclerc very much. He has rendered us great services as President of the Bankruptcy Court. He always wished to bring Gambetta and me together. One day he proposed to me an interview, and, in order that it should excite no remark, I was to meet him, as if by chance, in the Bois de Boulogne, with M. Gambetta. But I did not wish it, any more than I should have wished any other interview. The Count of Chambord came one day to Versailles, even into my ante-room, within twenty steps of my cabinet. He was with one of my friends, who came and told me that the Count of Chambord was there. But I replied that I could not see him, in spite of my great respect for him. His grandfather treated kindly my family, who came originally from Ireland, and he also created my father and my brother peers of France. But as President of the Republic, I could not see him, neither did I wish to do so. Prince Napoleon also asked for another interview with me which I refused.

“I will not therefore take M. Duclerc ; but since I accept M. Jules Simon, what more can be asked of me ?”

M. Waddington remarked that the important thing to know was, whether they were strong enough to fight Gambetta. It was very certain that he led the Chamber. One could try to deprive him of this leadership, but could M. Dufaure resume his own sway ? Thereupon the Marshal interrupted him by saying : “But if you do not want M. Dufaure, what do you wish me to do ?”

M. Teisserenc replied that he was the intimate friend of M. Dufaure, and that the point was not to know whether he or his friends wished to be with M. Dufaure (about which there could be no doubt whatever), but whether M. Dufaure could reappear before the Chambers with a cabinet in which M. de Marcère, Minister of the Interior, would be simply replaced by another minister for that department. Public opinion had set General Berthaut, Minister of War, and M. de Marcère, in opposition to each other. If M. de Marcère were rejected, and General Berthaut were to remain, there would at once be an interpellation in the Chamber.

The Marshal replied that he made no point of honor in politics, as he had already remarked, and that one of his friends, who was a very

sensible adviser, an ex-member of the National Assembly, had always insisted upon that with him ; but in the case of General Berthaut it was quite another thing. Here there was a real point of honor. It was impossible to abandon him. First of all, one could not change a Minister of War every six months, for if foreign affairs became complicated, it would be most dangerous.

Finally the Marshal strongly insisted upon knowing whether or not they refused to allow him to make overtures to M. Simon.

M. Christophle thought that it would probably be useless, but all the other ministers did not share this opinion.

M. Teisserenc remarked that there had been a question of inviting M. Bardoux to a seat in the cabinet, and that it was also very necessary to make an offer to him.

The Marshal said that he would write to that effect to M. Dufaure without delay.

M. Léon Say remarked that there was a point which affected him personally, and which had not been touched upon. The Marshal had said that General Berthaut and M. de Marcère could not remain together in the same cabinet on account of what had taken place at the sitting of December 2. It was necessary that the Marshal should know what took place at that sitting. There were only three ministers on the ministerial bench. M. Christophle was at one extremity surrounded by his general-advisers ; at the other extremity were seated M. de Marcère and M. Léon Say. When M. Laussedat presented his order of the day, M. de Marcère learned towards M. Léon Say to ask his opinion. M. Léon Say's advice had been to accept it. If therefore to-day M. de Marcère went out of the cabinet because he had accepted this order of the day, it would be difficult to understand why M. Léon Say should remain.

The Marshal replied that there was nothing official in that, that no one need know whether there had been any understanding between them or not, and that after all M. Léon Say could not go out of the cabinet, because M. Dufaure had said that he would not remain in it without him.

The council broke up at eleven o'clock, and was adjourned until the result of the interviews with M. Dufaure and M. Jules Simon should be known.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Encyclopaedia Biblica : A Critical Dictionary of the Literary, Political and Religious History, the Archaeology, Geography and Natural History of the Bible. Edited by the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford and formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Canon of Rochester, and J. SUTHERLAND BLACK, M.A., LL.D., formerly Assistant Editor of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Vol. II.: E to K. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Adam and Charles Black. 1901. Pp. 772.)

THE general character of this Dictionary and of the contents of Vol. I. have been described in a former number of this REVIEW (V. 543-545). The present volume follows the lines of its predecessor: it has a similar wealth of material, and is marked by the same freedom of critical research unhampered by regard for traditional opinions. Special attention is shown to the study of clan-names, a branch of inquiry which has been very little pursued, but may yield important results. Folk-lore and legend are abundantly represented, though, strangely enough, the translations of Enoch and Elijah, to which there are so many parallels in ancient beliefs and which suggest so many interesting questions, are passed over with hardly a word of discussion. The volume contains a great number of conjectural emendations of the Hebrew text, some probable, some improbable; in the latter class we may place the explanation of the name Jericho (col. 2396), the substitution of "Jair" for "Jephthah" (col. 2360), the etymology of "Emim" (col. 1289), and some others; but these remarks are usually given as conjectures, and may easily be distinguished by the general reader from what is offered as assured fact.

The material of interest to the historical student is considerable. All the current histories of Egypt and Ethiopia are more or less antiquated—so great has been the progress of recent discovery—and it is therefore a matter of importance to have a conspectus by a careful scholar which shall point out exactly what may be accepted as history in the light of present knowledge; such a discriminating statement is found in the articles by Professor W. M. Müller, of Philadelphia, in which the questions of Egyptian chronology, Manetho's dynasties, the alleged discovery of the tomb of Menes (the first historical king), the Hyksos, the primitive religion, the manners and customs of Egypt, and the history of Ethiopia are treated with great precision, and with references to all important books. With a constantly growing inscriptional literature no such

sketch can be regarded as final, but it is well to have a brief statement of the latest results of investigation. The article on Israel (its political history), by Professor Guthe, of Leipzig, discusses the origins of the people at length and brings the story of its fortunes down to the building of Aelia Capitolina on the site of Jerusalem by Hadrian (A. D. 135). Thanks to the Amarna letters (which gave a picture of Canaan about 1400 B. C.), and to our fuller knowledge of Egyptian and Hittite history, it is now possible to understand the nature of the Israelite migrations better than ever before. Much in this episode, however, is still obscure, and Guthe's narrative of the movements of the tribes is necessarily tentative; we do not know how many tribes there were at the outset, and the pre-Canaanite history of Israel is largely enveloped in mystery. But at least we are able to see that the better account of the invasion of Canaan is given in the book of Judges, and that the story in Joshua is mostly a romance, an ecclesiastical construction of the sixth or fifth century B. C. Other valuable historical articles are those on Edom (by Professor Nöldeke, of Strassburg), on the Philistine cities Gath, Gaza, etc. (by Canon Cheyne), on the Herodian family (by Professor Woodhouse, of St. Andrews), and on Jerusalem (by Professor G. A. Smith, of Glasgow). There is also an admirable account (by Professor Francis Brown, of New York) of the geographical knowledge of the Hebrews of the pre-Christian period, with maps showing the limits of their world at different epochs. Contributions to social history are found in the articles on government, education, kinship, the family, food, handicrafts, embroidery, and other such topics.

Biblical literature is largely represented; there are critical articles on eighteen books of the Old Testament, twelve of the New Testament, and three of the Apocrypha. The articles on the Gospels and Galatians reach the dimensions of treatises; it is questionable whether it is judicious in such an *Encyclopaedia* to discuss at enormous length the relative merits of the "North Galatian" and the "South Galatian" theories—the gist of the matter might have been put satisfactorily in smaller compass. This charge applies only to the two articles just mentioned; the rest are of reasonable length. The latest stages in the process of the disintegration of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Job are set forth clearly, and whether or not one accepts the conclusions of the writers, the principles of criticism are illustrated in their discussions. In the case of certain books whose origin is doubtful, as Habakkuk, Hebrews, James, Jude, and the Johannine writings, the present position of research is stated judiciously; and there is an interesting account of a recently discovered short recension of the book of Judith, for which there may possibly be a real (though vague) historical basis.

A number of other important subjects are treated. The article on Eschatology, by Professor Charles, of Dublin, is an abridgment of his book with the same title; though it has some untenable positions (particularly in its view of the Hebrew conception of soul and spirit), it is a valuable contribution to the doctrine of eschatology. Professor

Jülicher, of Marburg, wrestles with Essenism, which, in spite of recent investigations, remains an enigmatic phenomenon; it belongs to Greek culture as well as to Jewish, and awaits the discovery of the key which is to unlock the secret of its origin and significance. The history of the Eucharistic meal is treated cautiously by Canon Robinson, of Cambridge; the statements in the Gospels, in Corinthians and in later books, are compared, and Greek parallels are mentioned, but no definite conclusion as to origin and development is reached; here also is an unsolved problem. The article on Jesus of Nazareth, by the late Professor A. B. Bruce, of the Free Church College, Glasgow, is an attempt to give a plain biography of the man, apart from all ecclesiastical presuppositions. The writer admits the difficulty of separating the historical from the legendary in the accounts of the life, and the doubt attaching to certain sayings attributed by the Gospel tradition to Jesus; he holds, however, that a definite kernel of fact remains, and that a great moral and religious career is evident. As to the healing of bodily diseases, whether or not, says Bruce, they be regarded as miraculous, they were the work not of a thaumaturge, but of a friend of man. Bruce is not quite able to decide whether Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, but thinks that, with the picture of the man of sorrow (the ideal Israel) in mind (Isa. liii.), he thought of himself as that "man," the representative of all who live sacrificial and therefore redemptive lives. Though, says Bruce, Jesus was the child of his time and people, with limitation of vision (for example, in his statements respecting the future), his spiritual intuitions are valid for all ages. This is a reasonable conclusion; but it is to be regretted that Professor Bruce did not attempt a sharp criticism of the sayings attributed to Jesus.

C. H. Toy.

The Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews. By LYMAN ABBOTT. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company. 1901. Pp. xiii, 408.)

THE BIBLE, it has been said, is the best-neglected book in the world. In the English translation it has become an English classic, is accessible to everybody, is read every Sunday in the churches, and is read by many at home; yet its real significance is perhaps less understood than that of Homer or Shakspeare. This is largely because it has been made a theological text-book, and has thus lost its interest for the people. At present a sort of Biblical revival is going on; a number of books, of which the present volume is one, have undertaken to set forth the literary attractiveness and the human appeal of the Bible, and thus to bring its great power to bear on our people. He who would be an efficient advocate of its claims must be in sympathy both with the scientific exposition of its origin and meaning and with its moral and religious spirit. This remark holds true of the whole of the Bible, Old Testament and New Testament; but the New Testament has not yet found its expounder—

all efforts are directed to the Old Testament. It is with this latter that Dr. Abbott deals, and deals, we need hardly say, in a very interesting way. He is known as an eloquent expositor, and as one who accepts in general the results of the modern criticism of the Old Testament, and he has succeeded in bringing out its human side, and its permanent significance. He points out the vague and inexact character of the old Hebrew historical writing, the gradual development of the legal codes, the origin of the Biblical "fiction" (in such legends as that of Samson), the literary excellence of the imaginative stories of Ruth, Jonah and Esther, the idyllic charm of the Song of Songs, the profound philosophy of life contained in Job, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, the spiritual beauty of the Psalter, and the ethical strenuousness and unquenchable hope of the prophets. The message of Israel to the world he conceives to be this: that God demands of man only righteousness, and that on this condition man may enter into a relation of comradeship with God. Jesus of Nazareth he regards as the fulfillment of Israel's aspirations.

It does not enter into Dr. Abbott's plan to consider the parallelisms between the Hebrew and other ancient literatures; such a comparison would be helpful, but would require considerable space. His description of Hebrew thought as a natural product of the Hebrew national life is in the main just, and he knows how to distinguish between the essential and the accidental; his point of view is indicated in the following sentence: "Whether Jesus Christ was born in Bethlehem or in Nazareth is not a question which materially affects the moral character of mankind" (p. 42). In a few cases the present reviewer would prefer statements different from those made by Dr. Abbott: the scene of the book of Job lies not in a remote age, prior to 1250 B. C., but in the fifth or fourth century B. C. (p. 234); Josephus is not an authority for the life of Moses (p. 92 n.)—he knew nothing more than what he got from the Biblical text; there is no reason to suppose that Moses got religious ideas from the Egyptians (p. 96), or indeed that he was a monotheist; it is extremely improbable, if not quite impossible, that any of the Biblical psalms should have been composed as early as the time of David (p. xi); it is not likely that Solomon had any definite religious training (p. 289 ff), or that his character was highly complex; the opinion is now gaining ground that the Song of Songs (which is a product of the Greek period) is based on a rustic wedding-festival, and that Solomon is not a personage of the poem (Ch. ix); Hebrew offerings were not all voluntary (p. 154)—on the contrary, time and character were generally fixed by law (see Lev. and Numb. *passim*). These points do not affect the general validity of Dr. Abbott's argument.

C. H. Toy.

Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects (Mediaeval and Modern Times). By W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D. (Cambridge University Press. 1900. Pp. xii, 300.)

PROFESSOR CUNNINGHAM has a way of breaking new ground. He is essentially a pioneer. His *Growth of English Industry and Commerce* introduced for the first time the ideas of continuity of development and correlation of parts into the broad domain of English economic history. The work which this volume completes and of which it is decidedly the most important half is similarly a book on new lines. It is not an economic history, nor is it an economic interpretation of history. It is rather a study of the influence of the other great forces of history on economic conditions. It is an examination of economic history in the light of all the other influences which combined to make each period what it was: an effort to appraise the contribution of each nation and period to civilization, especially to civilization in its economic aspect. It is, therefore, a book of generalizations, of broad views, of suggestions, of insight, of grouping of facts, rather than of investigation and detailed statements.

Dr. Cunningham distinguishes three periods since the fall of the Roman Empire. The first is Christendom as reconstructed after the confusions of the barbaric invasions; united by its common religious belief and ecclesiastical subordination to Rome, depending on traditions and survivals of the Empire for its industrial arts, but distinguished from it by its higher conception of the dignity of man and its fuller recognition of human responsibility in the use of wealth. This period reached its culmination in the centuries from the twelfth to the fifteenth. The great discoveries of the fifteenth century brought in another age marked by the realization of vaster possibilities of wealth to be gained by trading with the Orient and America, and more complete utilization of the internal resources of the separate nations that were being organized, of the possible solution by thought and effort of the problems of national greatness. This period involved a gradual "secularization" of daily life as opposed to the ecclesiastical administration of the Middle Ages, a disruption of the unity of Christendom due to the Reformation and to the stronger national tendencies, and an elevation of capital into the position of the most influential of all economic factors. This second period endured till in the eighteenth century a sudden introduction of improvements in the industrial arts initiated another age of rapid economic changes. The most striking characteristic of this period is its apparently irresistible tendency to overspread and modify the portions of the world not heretofore affected by Western civilization and perhaps even to assimilate them to its own characteristics.

The details on which the description of the first of these periods is based are largely worked out by Dr. Cunningham himself. For the later and more extensive periods he is naturally more dependent on other investigators. The bibliographical references to these numerous varied

and critically chosen monographs are not the least valuable and interesting part of the work. Two chapters of especial interest are on "Christian Relations with Heathen and Moslems" in the Middle Ages and "Rival Commercial Empires" in more modern times.

But this constant generalization and comparison costs its price in the shape of occasional strained analogies and artificial interpretations. If we declared the author's estimate of the influence of religion upon trade in the Middle Ages an exaggerated one, it might be considered simply a difference of opinion, could we not convict him out of his own mouth. He says that "Christianity reconstituted the economic life of the old world," that "Christendom was one organized society for all the purposes of economic life." "Christendom was extraordinarily homogeneous." Yet, when he comes to describe trade between Christian merchants and the Mohammedan inhabitants of Morocco, he says, "It is curious to observe that there is little difference between the provisions laid down and those which were necessary for the prosecution of industry made within Christendom." In other words, it was Christianity which gave medieval trade its peculiar shape, but it had just the same shape under Mohammedanism. A safe inference would seem to be that the major premise is incorrect and that trade and religion had very little to do with one another. Similarly the contrasts of policy of the successive colonizing nations, Portugal, Holland, Spain, France, England, seem a little too symmetrical for real life, and lead one to wonder what single guiding spirit is left to characterize the latest of all colonizing nations and the one in which we have the most interest. But we cannot have broad results without some bold generalizations, and immersed as most students are for the greater part of their time in the study of details, they may well accept thankfully and without cavil the thoughtful, suggestive and original book which Dr. Cunningham has given them.

E. P. CHEYNEY.

A Study of the Court of Star Chamber, largely based on Manuscripts in the British Museum and the Public Record Office. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.] By CORA L. SCOFIELD. (Chicago: The University Press. 1900. Pp. xxx, 82.)

THIS monograph is a helpful contribution to the history of English institutions and it is decidedly an encouraging product of American university training. Few subjects are more interesting or more complex than the evolution of the various courts and councils from their germ in the original *magnum concilium* or great *curia regis* of the early Norman times. Among the many hard questions connected with this development, perhaps the hardest is the problem of the origin and primitive character of the so-called Star Chamber court. The author has appealed to the existing sources; and if these have not enabled her in some vital points to reach positive demonstration, she has at any rate led us very close to the truth. Aside from the printed books, comprising state

papers, historical collections, and the ancient legal treatises, such as those of Lambard, Hudson, and Crompton, the mass of manuscript material consulted is impressive, both in its extent and in its character. Yet here the scholar is confronted by the ever recurring misfortune—the loss of early records. “In fact, the most valuable records of the Court are no longer to be found.” On August 19, 1608, “the Lord Chancellor delivered to Sir Francis Bacon, then become clerk of the Star Chamber,” six books of the “Kallender of Orders,” extending from the first year of Henry VII. to the thirty-second year of Elizabeth; but their “ultimate fate is unknown. A committee of the House of Lords reported in 1719 that the last notice of the decrees and orders ‘that could be got was that they were in St. Bartholomew’s Close, London.’ No efforts have succeeded in bringing them to light.” The author’s treatment of the bibliography of her subject is commendable.

In the “Introduction” the rise of the Privy Council, in its uncertain relation to the surviving Ordinary Council, is traced; and the ineffectual attempts to curb its jurisdiction are considered. At the accession of Henry VII., the King’s Council “in the usual meaning of the term” was the Privy Council; and it had a “large and but partially defined jurisdiction, the justification of which was found in part in the inadequacy of the common law and of the rules of the Chancery, and in part in the inability of the courts of the kingdom to see that justice was done when might and right were ranged on opposite sides.”

The body of the monograph is divided into four sections, for which it would have been better had appropriate headings been given. The first section is the most important, dealing mainly with the dual problem of the composition and jurisdiction of the court as affected by the famous statute of 3 Hen. VII., c. 1. After a careful and minute examination of the source-materials the conclusion is reached that in the reign of Henry VIII., as also in that of Henry VII., neither the membership nor the jurisdiction of the court conformed to the statute of 3 Hen. VII., c. 1, as usually interpreted. Moreover, the King’s Council is found performing the same functions as the court, whether sitting in the “Camera Stellata” or elsewhere; and, conversely, the powers of the Star Chamber appear to be equivalent, even in state matters, to those of the Council itself. The Star Chamber in fact claimed its vast jurisdiction on the ground that it was the King’s Council. The court and its partisans were therefore historically justified in asserting that its constitution and power were older than Henry’s statute. “The justice of the Council’s claim to such an enormous authority might rightly be questioned, but not the Star Chamber’s right to exercise that authority when conceded.” The purpose of Henry’s statute was probably fourfold. In the first place, a “warning was given to offenders of every degree that another and very vigorous attempt would be made to crush out certain crying evils.” In the second place, “the statute definitely recognized a somewhat summary form of proceeding, which, in part at least, was not new to the Council.” In the third place, “without prohibiting any judicial au-

thority then claimed by the Council, it again outlined the jurisdiction of the Council in a liberal and not too definite manner, specially vested that body with a right to punish certain crimes which were particularly rife at the time, and, above all, placed its jurisdiction upon a lawful and permanent basis." In the fourth place, its purpose "was probably to name a choice of judges and to give to a small committee, as did other statutes to other committees, the power of acting for the whole Council in certain matters." The two chief justices were members of the Star Chamber; but their right to sit in it "did not arise, as did the right of the other judges, from the fact that they were privy councillors." They owed their position "to stat. 3 Hen. VII., c. 1, and in this fact is a partial justification of the current opinion that the court owed its foundation to that statute." The vital point of differentiation, therefore, between the two bodies is the presence of the two chief justices in the Star Chamber.

In the other three sections, the functions, the officers and organization, and the procedure of the court are respectively considered. These cannot be here analyzed. It must suffice to say that this excellent monograph enables us to appreciate as never before the vast significance of the Star Chamber in provoking the struggle for constitutional liberty during the Tudor and Stuart reigns.

GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD.

Henry Barrow, Separatist, (1550?-1593) and the Exiled Church of Amsterdam, (1593-1622). By FRED J. POWICKE, Ph.D. (London: James Clarke and Co. 1900. Pp. xlviii, 364.)

THE latest illustration of the renewed interest in Congregational origins recently manifested in England is this handsomely printed volume, in which a scholarly English Congregational minister sets forth the life of the most eminent of the martyrs for Congregational principles and discusses the fate of the exiled church of which he was a leader while it was still on English soil. Barrowe must always be reckoned among the most interesting of the early Separatists. His excellent social position, his dramatic conversion, his long imprisonment, his passionate responses to his judges and his fiery championship of the views for which he bravely died give to his story unfading picturesqueness. If he contributed little to the theoretic development of Separatist principles that Robert Browne had not already anticipated, his is a much more satisfactory career to contemplate than that of the ill-balanced and ultimately apostate earlier reformer. Dr. Powicke has felt the force of these considerations perhaps over-much, and is inclined to the conclusion that Barrowe, "rather than Robert Browne and John Robinson, deserves to be named emphatically the founder of English Congregationalism." But the author recognizes that "such a judgment may be questioned." Certainly many would dissent from it.

Dr. Powicke has investigated anew such facts as are now accessible from which a sketch of Barrowe's life and work may be drawn. If he has

been able to add comparatively little to the story as already told by Rev. Dr. Henry M. Dexter, that result is not because of any lack of fresh and patient delving on his part, but by reason of the thoroughness of the earlier gleaner in the field. In one very important particular, however, Dr. Powicke corrects Dr. Dexter's portrait. To Dr. Dexter it seemed exceedingly probable that Barrowe was the author of the much-discussed Martin Marprelate tracts. The arguments which Dr. Powicke advances in refutation of this claim have great and apparently conclusive weight.

Besides his consideration of the life of Barrowe, Dr. Powicke discusses with much fullness Barrowe's doctrine of the Church, and his relations to the Puritans whose views in many respects resembled his own, yet to whom his Separatism was intensely distasteful, and whom he treated with scorn. He shows, also, Barrowe's essential sympathy with some positions characteristic of the Anabaptists—a sympathy which did not extend, however, to many articles of their faith, and could not overcome the intense repugnance which Barrowe felt for that party which in the Reformation age was everywhere spoken against. In chapters of less value Dr. Powicke discusses the bishops of Barrowe's time and vindicates for Archbishop Whitgift a conscientious and consistent, if cruel and relentless, policy in dealing with Puritans and Separatists.

Dr. Powicke's most valuable contribution to the story of the London Separatist congregation in its exile at Amsterdam after martyrdom had deprived it of the leadership of Barrowe and Greenwood is his searching criticism of such portions of Professor Edward Arber's *Story of the Pilgrim Fathers* as paint the moral condition of the congregation as prevailingly evil and, in particular, hold up its pastor, Francis Johnson, as unworthy of confidence and as making a "death-bed recantation." No reader of Professor Arber's volume can afford to overlook Dr. Powicke's examination of its allegations on these topics.

Dr. Powicke has paid a good deal of attention to the dates and sequences of the various conferences held by the commissions appointed by the Bishop of London with Barrowe and Greenwood, who were then in prison. In most instances his solutions seem to the reviewer to be accurate; though the problem is one of great perplexity, chiefly owing to the frequent indication of the months by number, and the uncertainty as to whether the enumeration uniformly began with January, or sometimes commenced with March. How perplexing the matter sometimes is may be illustrated by the fact that the conference between Hutchinson and Greenwood, which is recorded in *Certain Sclaunderous Articles* as of the "9. day of the 3. Moneth," was dated by Dr. Dexter in his *Congregationalism as seen in its Literature* as of March 1589, while the writer has seen a copy of the pamphlet containing the original record, purchased by Dr. Dexter subsequently to the publication of his learned volume just cited, in which he had interpreted the date in a marginal annotation as of May 1590. Dr. Powicke puts it in March 1590, which seems to the writer to be correct.

In most instances the exact date is of little consequence, but regarding the beginning of Barrowe's imprisonment a more important problem arises. In the account of his examination immediately consequent upon his arrest written by Barrowe, and published soon after his death, he, or his printer, gave the date of the beginning of his imprisonment as November 19, 1586, and further described it as "this 19th being the Lord's day." That date Dr. Powicke, like Dr. Dexter, accepts. Now, Barrowe's arrest took place on a visit to his imprisoned friend, Greenwood; and though Dr. Dexter, moved by Barrowe's apparent definiteness of date, gave a guarded assent to Dr. Waddington's opinion that Greenwood's arrest took place in the autumn of 1586, the testimony of the State Papers points much more to October 1587 as its true epoch. Barrowe, or his printer, probably made an error in designating the year; and a decided confirmation of this conclusion is to be found in the fact that November 19 fell on Sunday in 1587, not in 1586, a fact which Dr. Dexter and Dr. Powicke have overlooked. If Barrowe's imprisonment really began in November 1587, it makes readily comprehensible his statement, in the spring of 1590, that he had "been two years and well-nigh a half kept by the bishops in close prison," without resorting to conjecture, as Dr. Powicke does, as to a possible mitigation of his imprisonment in 1587. It seems supported also by Barrowe's statement in the letter written immediately before his death, in April 1593, affirming that he had sustained "well neer six yeres imprisonment." Barrowe would have said "more than," had his incarceration begun in 1586.

The careful reader will query, probably, why Dr. Powicke, in his bibliography of Barrowe's writings, omits to give the full title of *A Collection of Certain Letters and Conferences*, on the ground that the title-page was damaged in the copy that he consulted. It is recorded under No. 170, in Dr. Dexter's bibliography of Congregational literature. One wonders, also, why he should have chosen to give the title and reprint the text of the *True Description . . . of the Visible Church* from the modified edition of 1641, rather than from the original of 1589. Dr. Powicke is so familiar with the original that he collates its readings on the margin of his text of 1641. The natural proceeding would have been to have printed the original in the place of honor. But these are not very serious blemishes on a conscientious and painstaking work.

WILLISTON WALKER.

A Critical Examination of Irish History, being a Replacement of the False by the True, from the Elizabethan Conquest to the Legislative Union of 1800. By T. DUNBAR INGRAM, LL.D. (London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co.; Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co. 1900. Two vols., pp. vi, 354, 350.)

DR. INGRAM has produced not a history but a controversial pamphlet in two volumes, whose purpose is to prove the theses that England has

been the only benefactor of Ireland; and that the Papacy and the Irish have been alone responsible for the sufferings of the country. His treatment is everywhere inadequate, particularly in the first volume, which covers a period of 184 years, while the second is devoted to but 16. There is nothing that can be regarded as an account of Ireland under Charles I., or of the Cromwellian conquest, or of the penal laws, which are discussed interminably without once being described. Even where a topic is fully treated, there is an almost complete absence of facts favorable to any but the author's view. He condemns the Irish for refusing to take the oath of allegiance in 1606, when this would have freed them from the consequences of the penal laws, but does not say that the penalties of the recusancy laws would not thus have been escaped; he holds the Catholics accountable for the later penal laws because they declined in 1666 to sign a remonstrance, but he omits to mention that the Duke of Ormond stated that this remonstrance was purposely so drawn as to make it impossible for many Catholics to sign, though Mr. Osmund Airy long ago called his attention to this fact. He quotes Justice Keating's letter to James in behalf of English possessors of Irish land as evidence of the pernicious character of the Irish Act of Repeal in 1689, but fails to state that the letter was written before the bill was passed and while it was still uncertain what it would contain. These instances are examples of what is common throughout. The distortion of evidence is equally prevalent, especially in the author's inveterate habit of drawing unjustifiable inferences from the statements of all who are on the other side of the question.

Even more irritating are his sweeping generalizations: "There is no reason to doubt that if the Irish branch of the great Celtic family had been left to itself, it would gladly have accepted incorporation with the English people;" "Perfect toleration and perfect equality existed in Ireland before the great rebellion of 1641;" "The Roman Catholics . . . were not actuated by any racial antipathies to the English or to the Anglo-Irish. Such a feeling never existed." This regrettable tendency to say more than the evidence will support is accompanied by an acrimonious temper: Mr. Lecky's assertions reveal "infinite folly, prejudice and ignorance;" Macaulay displays "gross partiality" and "narrow bigotry;" Burke's conduct in 1785 was "extremely dishonest;" Flood was "thoroughly unscrupulous;" George Ponsonby "insincerity personified;" the leaders of the United Irishmen "murderous mountebanks;" the Whig Club a "mischievous and contemptible body;" Grattan uttered "crazy and pitiful nonsense," "seditious and inflammatory rant," and was inspired by "the mad rage of disappointment, measureless vanity, and profound ignorance of the constitution and laws of Ireland;" while the last Irish Parliament was "the most worthless and incompetent assembly that ever misgoverned a country." Such unqualified condemnation refutes itself.

The book seems to have been written hastily and the author's materials are poorly digested, for the same statements and the narration of

the same events continually recur. Nevertheless, Dr. Ingram has studied the printed sources and even some manuscript sources, and occasionally his points are well-made. In minor matters he furnishes corrections to Lecky; he is justified in laying stress upon the political side of the penal laws, and upon the fact that the Catholics in a measure provoked the passage of such laws; it is true, too, that the Irish woolen industry was of little moment when it was suppressed by the English in 1699; that the Irish Parliament was venal and corrupt, and that the estates of absentees should have been taxed; but even when right it is inevitable that he should not receive the credit of being so, since the reader is rendered suspicious by the violence of his tone, his evident bias, and his indiscriminate abuse of his opponents.

RALPH C. H. CATTERALL.

La Noblesse Française sous Richelieu. Par le Vicomte G. d'AVENEL.
(Paris: Armand Colin. 1901. Pp. 355.)

THE matter in this book is not new. In his elaborate and valuable work *Richelieu et la Monarchie Absolue*, published twenty years ago, the Vicomte G. d'Avenel treated of the condition of the nobility when Richelieu ruled over France. What was there said formed a part of three large volumes. The author has now printed by itself the portion which relates to the nobility, in one moderate-sized volume.

For the most part, the matter contained in the former work is reprinted word for word. Some additions have been made, of no great importance, and some slight changes made in the text. We notice that in giving the relative values of money, the author formerly estimated that a livre in the days of Richelieu had a purchasing power equal to six francs in our times. He now gives the equivalent value as five-fold. Such a multiplicity of circumstances have to be considered in estimating the relative values of money at different epochs, that at best one can only make a rough guess.

It was probably judicious to select the portion of the former work which treated of the nobility, that it might be presented in more convenient shape to the reading public. For the majority of readers, the French nobility is the most interesting of the institutions of the old régime. Certainly it was the most picturesque, though it was far from being the most useful. The Vicomte d'Avenel thinks that the forms of freer government still existed when Richelieu assumed power and should have been utilized by him, yet he finds little fault with the Cardinal's treatment of the French nobles. Indeed, his judgment upon the body of which he is a member has become more unfavorable, after twenty years of reflection. In 1881 he wrote: "History has been severe toward the nobility, sometimes even unjust." In the present volume he contents himself with saying that "History has been severe," without suggesting that it has been unjust. No follower of the Cardinal could have defended his policy toward the French nobility with more vigor than our

author. "The decline of the nobility," he says, "ought not to be imputed solely to Richelieu. If the nobility fell, it was not from any particular cause, or by the act of any particular man, it fell because it was unfit to govern. . . . The privileges which it retained for services rendered by its ancestors, were the interest on a debt which had become onerous to the community and which ought to have been cancelled."

In an age when individual valor was becoming of less value in the battlefield, and familiarity with political questions was more required at the council table, the importance of the French nobleman steadily diminished. As our author says: "He gave little attention to his private affairs, and still less to public affairs. He was neither artistic nor scholarly. He disdained agriculture, he despised commerce." He was indeed a curious contrast to the English nobleman, who divided his time between an active interest in political questions, and a thrifty care of his own finances. It is not strange that the privileges which the French nobility retained, became irritating to the community. The condition of public feeling in the time of Richelieu was far removed from that in the days preceding the Revolution, yet even the nobility as a body had no popular hold. And for this reason it was easy for Richelieu to diminish the uncertain and precarious power which the nobles still possessed; by their own fault they had ceased to be an important factor in the state, and their intermittent turbulence was checked by the Cardinal.

Picturesque, the French nobility certainly was, but it was frivolous to an unusual extent. The details of dress, the details of extravagance, the details of folly, fill many pages of this book. As a class, the nobility were strangely devoid of true ambition. Of unimportant privileges and dignities, they were indeed most tenacious. The chronicles of the times are filled with quarrels over questions of etiquette. The right to walk first in the procession, the right to receive first the incense from the priest, were held with tenacity. But real power slipped from their listless grasp. They were indifferent as to their political rights, because they were absorbed in the pursuits of vanity and pleasure. "The French nobility," says our author, "was condemned to die from inanition and sterile pride." Such is the epitaph which history places upon a body, which might have played in the development of modern France as great a part as the English nobility took in the growth of the English constitution.

There are a few criticisms to be passed upon M. d'Avenel's work. His position as an authority on French history has been for many years established. The present work is not new, but it serves to draw attention once more to one of the most interesting elements in the French nation, at a period when, under the influence of an extraordinary man, the French monarchy was undergoing great and permanent changes.

JAMES BRECK PERKINS.

Wesley and Methodism. By F. J. SNELL, M.A. Oxon. ["The World's Epoch-Makers."] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. x, 244.)

THIS volume is a short, readable biography which portrays some of the prominent features of John Wesley's life and work in orderly arrangement. Some of the biographies of great men which have been published recently are too bulky. This sketch of Wesley's life is, on the other hand, somewhat too restricted. A fulness of impression such as the magnitude of the subject might lead one to expect can scarcely be gained in the limitations of this neat volume. After reading such estimates as Green, Augustine Birrell, and many other historians and critics have written of the era of the Wesleyan revival in the eighteenth century, one cannot easily rid himself of the conviction that the movement begun by the Wesleys was nothing less than a tidal wave in religious history. The story of John Wesley and Methodism is remarkable. In dramatic power, in variety of situation, in the play of the deeper sentiments and passions of a moral life upon a broad arena, in the signal effects produced upon an entire nation and its subsequent history, the tale is not only far beyond any mere romance in value, but it has a vital interest which no imaginative work could carry. There is breadth enough in the management of details of this life of Wesley to give the reader a clear view of the state of the times through which Wesley lived and labored for the regeneration of England. The degeneracy of the established church; the worldliness of its clergy; the low standard of morals at the royal court, in high life and among the poor; the great hunger for better things throughout England—evidenced by the crowds which the field-preaching gathered in every part of the kingdom from Cornwall to Scotland; the hostilities which broke out in many of these multitudinous gatherings, the mobbing, the insults, the persecution, all of which were simply the violence and rending of the demons of English life as they, many of them, met the time of exorcism; all this is sketched with spirit and brevity.

Some unnecessary flings are here and there embodied in a single phrase; as, for example, in recounting Wesley's rescue in childhood from his father's burning house, this author says: "When, in later life, Wesley became *saturated with the idea of hell*, he looked back to this incident as emblematical of another conflagration and another escape." This implication of such "saturation" is a wrong against the man who for more than fifty years, in thousands of sermons, preached the unbounded, everlasting love of God with apostolic fervor.

Some over-emphasizing of the eccentricities of Wesley are apparent in this narrative, partly because the qualities of his greatness are not raised to the prominence which they deserve. It is true that Wesley believed in ghosts and witches; but so did many other men in that age who were men of weight and learning. Such facts, however, must be construed by the general mood of those times, and not be taken too seriously by critics of a later era. Wesley had some unfortunate expe-

riences in *affaires du cœur*; but other great men, long before and even since Socrates, have behaved awkwardly in seeking for a wife, and have even been unfortunately mated.

The Wesleys had many instances in their revival services of persons who acted like the demoniacs of Christ's day, as they passed through the experience of conversion—violent physical agitation, prostration, outcries, imprecations, and finally the emerging of a cleansed and pacified moral life. But these revival phenomena were less the effect of sensational preaching than they were the symptoms of that strangely pathological condition of moral life in England which was too weak to do more than to stagger into an apprehension of the Gospel of Righteousness when it was proclaimed in strong but simple terms.

WILLIAM EDWARDS HUNTINGTON.

Études sur l'Histoire Économique de la France (1760–1789). Par CAMILLE BLOCH. Preface de M. ÉMILE LEVASSEUR. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1900. Pp. ix, 269.)

THIS volume contains several essays on distinct phases of the old régime in France such as the municipal assemblies of 1787, the *cahiers*, the treaty of commerce of 1786. The most noteworthy of them are those on "Le Commerce des Grains dans la Généralité d'Orléans" and "La Répartition de la Propriété Foncière à la veille de la Révolution dans quelques paroisses de la Généralité d'Orléans." The latter touches the question of the amount of land owned by the peasantry, a subject on which opinion is still seriously divided. It would be difficult to answer such a question on the basis of an investigation of so narrow a field as the *généralité* of Orleans, and yet the state of affairs which M. Bloch has discovered in Orleans is doubly interesting because of its relation to the larger problem.

M. Bloch has drawn his inferences from the rolls for the *vingtièmes* in fifteen typical parishes. Although the returns are not in all cases complete or reliable he regards them as better than the returns for the *taille*, and as sufficiently trustworthy considering the scope of his inquiry. The statistical tables with which he supplements his treatment of the subject render his investigation useful in examining features of it to which he does not call special attention. He is interested in the holdings of the peasants rather than in the amount of land possessed by the Third Estate as a whole. His tables answer nearly all the questions one would like to ask, but they do not indicate the number of peasants who owned no land, because the returns include only the proprietors. Some of the figures are unusually instructive. Out of 35,707 arpents in the fifteen parishes the peasants held 15,947, the peasants and the bourgeois together, 22,828. In three parishes the peasants held more than the bourgeois, nobles, and ecclesiastics put together: in eight, they held more than the nobles. M. Bloch finds that the peasant holdings were generally small; the three sets of proprietors with which they are compared held from one and one-half to forty times as much per individual.

If the parishes M. Bloch has studied could be regarded as typical of France the conclusion must be drawn that the amount of land held by the peasants has been underestimated. Certainly he has chosen the right method for the solution of the problem, namely, the study of the parishes. If other scholars do for other *généralités* what he has done for Orleans the answer will speedily be forthcoming.

His essay on the grain trade in the same *généralité* explains the reasons for the failure of the attempt in 1763 and 1764 to free this trade from the restrictions which had been thrown about it since the sixteenth century. The fate of this first experiment makes clearer the obstacles against which Turgot was to struggle. M. Bloch presents tables, based on the market records, showing the price of wheat on every market day from January 1763 to January 1769. It is apparent that the price rose steadily from the end of 1764 to the latter part of 1768. The principal causes were the partial failure of the crops after 1764 and the consequent exhaustion of the surplus wheat accumulated in the granaries. Naturally such a rise of price affected the fortunes of the experiment, and M. Bloch has shown through the correspondence which passed between the ministers and the intendant, M. de Cypierre, how the government was frightened into a practical abandonment of the plan. Indeed although the ministers were convinced partisans of the régime of liberty they were so completely dominated by the habits of administrative paternalism that they had seriously interfered with the success of the scheme from the beginning. As soon as the rise in price became alarming the intendant began to complain in his letters of the conduct of speculators who bought the grain in the sheaf or in the granaries, without waiting until it was brought to market. He discovered that some of these speculators were buying "pour le compte et aux risques des intéressés," a powerful company not otherwise designated. In replying to his complaints the ministers made light of his fears and urged him not to intervene lest the people become alarmed; they gave him no information about the "company." Finally, however, in September, 1768, they acknowledge that there was a company with which the King had made a contract for the stocking of several magazines near Paris in order to provide against a shortage in the crops and a consequent famine. The ministers declare that the existence of such a contract did not justify the acts of particular speculators. But M. Bloch points out how the trade would be disorganized by the appearance of the agents of a company backed by royal credit. The operations of these men would excite the suspicions of the people and would give rise to the rumors which were at last transformed into the "Pacte de Famine." Indeed the existence of such a contract was nearly all the truth behind the terrible charge. The ministers had acted in good faith, but they had been dominated by their traditions rather than by the theories of the economists to which they professed so sincere a conversion. And M. de Cypierre's letters show that he was no more consistent than they, for he was over-ready to bring back the old regulations as soon as the speculators appeared. M. Bloch sums up the situation clearly

in the following words: "Ainsi, d'une part, un administrateur éclairé et généreux qui réclame les mesures les plus contraires à la liberté dont il est partisan; d'autre part, un gouvernement réformateur, désireux de corriger les erreurs administratives de ses prédécesseurs en matière de céréales, qui conserve sous la liberté les habitudes de la prohibition et rend impossible le commerce qu'il prétend favoriser."

HENRY E. BOURNE.

Kléber et Menou en Égypte depuis le Départ de Bonaparte, Août 1799—Septembre 1801. Documents publiés pour la Société d'Histoire Contemporaine par M. F. ROUSSEAU. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1900. Pp. lix, 455.)

THIS volume contains the correspondence of Generals Kléber and Menou as commanders of the French army in Egypt from the return of Bonaparte to France August 22, 1799, to the final capitulation. The Kléber papers extend from August 25, 1799, to June 14, 1800 (on which day Kléber was assassinated), those of Menou from June 16, 1800, to November 21, 1801. The papers comprise letters of these commanders, nearly all official, to the French government, to the English and Turkish commanders, to the civil and military authorities in Egypt, and to the French agents at the English and Turkish headquarters; as well as general administrative decrees and *ordres du jour*. In addition there are a number of letters from Menou to Kléber and to authorities in France, written during the period of Kléber's command. It is evident therefore (though it is nowhere explicitly stated) that the collection is intended to embrace only papers emanating from Kléber and Menou, and we are left to infer that it is in this sense exhaustive. The Kléber papers number 325, those of Menou 65; these are all printed *in extenso*, and in addition there is an appendix containing 41 Menou papers in briefest abstract.

We have here thus only one side (though the main one), of these two years in Egypt; we have no communications from the home government, from the English and Turks, nor from the diplomatic agents of the commanders. A peculiar feature is that 171 of the 390 documents had already been printed. It is true that some of these earlier publications are now difficult of access (as the "*Pièces relatives à l'Armée d'Orient*," published 1801); but there are few such, and fully a hundred of the 325 Kléber papers are taken from Pajol's *Kléber*, (published 1877). The source of the document is always carefully indicated, but it is annoying to find most of them without any place of writing shown. The editing otherwise seems careful; the introduction acutely discusses the characteristics of Kléber and Menou, and presents a judicious narrative on the basis of these papers and some supplementary material; the documents are accompanied by helpful notes. The publication of course cannot be presented as a full documentary presentation of the matter, and it does not seem likely to materially

modify earlier conclusions. The many points with regard to which it might be expected to do so are the negotiations between Kléber and Sir Sydney Smith for the Convention of El Arisch, later repudiated by Admiral Keith, and the controversy between Bonaparte and Kléber or their friends as to the condition in which the army and the finances were left by the former. On the first matter the important papers are not given; nor does the latter difficulty seem to be satisfactorily settled. The editor makes no effort to discuss the controversy carefully (see pp. xvi-xvii), and an examination of the papers does not leave us much better off, though on the whole they support Kléber.

As might be expected, the additions to our knowledge made by this publication are mainly as to the personalities of Kléber and Menou, and the methods of civil and military administration; we are left with vivid impressions of the men, and with fairly definite ideas as to how government was being conducted. It would be interesting to dwell on the attractive figure of Kléber; Menou decidedly loses in the contrast. There are some interesting and probably new side-lights on Bonaparte's previous conduct of affairs.

VICTOR COFFIN.

Lettres de Madame Reinhard à sa Mère, 1798-1815. Traduites de l'allemand et publiées pour la Société d'Histoire Contemporaine par la Baronne de WIMPFEN, née Reinhard. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1901. Pp. xxvii, 429.)

THIS volume of letters will immediately take a place among the most interesting publications of the Société d'Histoire Contemporaine. Written by the clever wife of a clever and responsible French diplomat, who, during the period covered by the letters (1798-1815) filled important posts at Florence, Berne, Jassy, Cassel, and in the Foreign Office at Paris, they furnish, as far as they go, a trustworthy record of the reaction of the French Revolution upon a number of smaller European governments, and teem with lively descriptions of persons and of places. The harvest of political fact, however, is not as considerable as it might have been if Madame Reinhard had not felt that she owed a certain consideration to her husband's position, and that she must not trust too deeply in a mail system which, in a period of wars and violence, was only too often operated for the benefit of one's enemies. But a reticence occasionally and voluntarily imposed does not, it will be recognized, impair the general spirit of probity and sincerity in which the letters are conceived. They were addressed to the writer's mother, before whom Madame Reinhard had no secrets, and such is their ease, uprightness, and charming, impressionistic volubility that they secure her a place among the masters of that difficult art of letter writing, in which none but women seem to arrive at excellence. These statements disclose where the real significance of this volume lies: not so much in new political facts as in personal appreciations of well-known contemporaries, and in vivacious

and ingenuous pictures of contemporary life. It is a cause for regret that the work is not complete, the editor, Madame Wimpffen, having found herself obliged for various reasons to give a selection merely of what seemed to her the most important letters, and it is a distinct diminution of their value that, although written originally in German, they are offered to the public in a French translation, the accuracy of which the reader has no means of controlling.

In the year 1796 Fräulein Reimarus, the daughter of a celebrated Hamburg physician, married Charles-Frédéric Reinhard, diplomatic representative in her native city of the new French republic. It is to be observed that Reinhard was himself a German, having been born in the year 1761 in the duchy of Württemberg. He is thus to be reckoned among that considerable band of his countrymen who, either for political or for personal reasons, expatriated themselves to seek their fortunes beyond the Rhine. Difficult as it is for a person living one hundred years after to believe, Reinhard, while becoming an excellent Frenchman whose loyalty was never questioned—he was rewarded toward the end of his life with a French peerage—remained always in the most intimate relations with literary and scientific Germany. He was a man with two loyalties, a loyalty of soul and a loyalty of hand and service, and he seems never to have felt or at least to have admitted their incompatibility. The statement holds also for his wife, who, although writing in German to a German mother established in Germany, and linked in her inner life almost exclusively with Germans, does not yield in clamorous French patriotism to any subject of Napoleon regularly baptized with water of the Seine. This national dualism, emblem and expression of the time when united France was the greatest political power of Europe, and divided Germany respectable merely as a great cultural power, gives the letters a psychological background that affects in a very complicated way the material presented by the writer and constantly renews the reader's interest. To give an example: Both Madame Reinhard and her husband entered in the year 1807 into very intimate relations with Goethe, for whom ever afterward they entertained the most profound admiration; yet the overthrow of Prussia, completed in this same year, and involving the overthrow of all Germany, arouses in the fair correspondent the most ardent expressions of satisfaction.

I have said that one's pleasure in this volume lies chiefly in the illuminating glimpses which we get of contemporary actors and contemporary manners. Napoleon, Goethe, the king of Saxony, Talleyrand, are rapidly drawn as they appeared at the moment of transit across the writer's vision, and the sketch has a palpability and picturesqueness that makes the object glow with more vitality than if it had been honored with a laborious essay. I do not think that the unsympathetic quality which made Madame de Staël so great a bore even to her admirers, has ever been more clearly or more maliciously illustrated than in the descriptions on page 99 and page 409. The glimpse of Napoleon racing sullenly through the famous gallery of Dresden (p. 340) is irresistibly funny, and

the several portraits of the declaiming and expounding Goethe (pp. 325-338) have more human value than a whole new *Jahrbuch* of the Goethe Gesellschaft. Mme. Reinhard makes her most serious effort in the journal of her Russian trip (p. 235 ff.), and the way in which the reader is brought near to Russian prisons, Russian officials and Russian landscape, must convince him that the writer's intellect is quite on a level with her artistic perceptions.

FERDINAND SCHWILL.

Souvenirs Politiques du Comte de Salaberry sur la Restauration, 1821-30. Publiés pour la Société d'Histoire Contemporaine par le Comte de SALABERRY son petit-fils. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1900. Two vols., pp. xix, 285, 325.)

THESE volumes are the latest publications of the "Société d'Histoire Contemporaine," and show a commendable activity on the part of that organization. But the society might easily have found more valuable objects of its preservative care; we have here in fact little more than a series of political pamphlets thrown into a connected narrative form (with the narrative very incomplete, and always a secondary and indeed incidental matter), and almost wholly unprovided with documents. Very little information of convincing weight is to be garnered here, and the accepted general conclusions are not affected. We are told much in regard to individuals both small and great that the close student will consider; but most of the personal sketches are hopelessly vague and incomplete, and of interest mainly as reflecting malicious political gossip. The author deigns to touch nothing that is not political; the student will search these volumes in vain for any direct light on general social or intellectual conditions.

The "Souvenirs" begin with the formation of the Villèle ministry in the middle of December 1821, and close with the elections of June 1830, Vol. II. beginning with 1826; the arrangement is loosely chronological, and the matter is divided into "Livres" on no perceptible principle. We therefore have here no information or reflections on the revolutionary events of 1830, though we reach the very verge of the catastrophe, and in the last pages (probably written after July 1830), have some statements with reference to preceding revolutionary disturbances that we suspect display knowledge after the event. The question of the date of the composition or final revision is invested with difficulty. The editor does not refer to the point (a fact which is representative of the value of the editing) and we are thrown entirely upon internal evidence. From this I conclude that these "essais" (as the author himself terms them,—II. 35), were written almost entirely in the reign of Charles X., and that the work was never carefully revised (frequent repetitions and abrupt ending); the writing was probably begun late in 1824 or early in 1825, and continued thereafter at probably never more than a year's distance from the events dealt with. They were evidently written for the public (see I. 9, 178; II. 35, 68), but apparently the revolution

of 1830 so interfered with the writer's position and plans (he lived in provincial literary labors till 1847) that he abandoned a publication that perhaps would not have been safe under the July monarchy (there are frequent attacks upon the Duc d'Orléans). What the editor has now done in the way of revision or arrangement is not shown; almost the only editorial work visible is a very inadequate biographical sketch, and a large amount of personal notes of this order: "Jean-Pierre-Claude-Nicolas Moyne-Petiot, député de Saone-et-Loire de 1828 à 1830; né en 1783, mort en 1853,"—information that we are given in regard to almost every individual mentioned (a vast number), no matter how incidental the reference or how obscure the person (generally however without any statement of political affiliations). And yet this is precisely a case where full editorial aid is essential, where it ought to be lavished in making clear to us obscure political situations and connections that the writer refers to in ordinary pamphleteering style.

What is the value of these "Souvenirs" to the investigator? They are written by a man of sixty who is a devoted Royalist of the more moderate Villèle section. They are written in the bitterness of impending or accomplished defeat by a man who had always been distinguished among his own narrow and passionate and intolerant associates for his uncompromising political positions and the violence of his expression of them.¹ It is evident therefore that we must scrutinize every sentence with deep distrust. The writer had been an émigré (as the editor naïvely puts it, "avait voyagé en Allemagne en 1790 et 1791"), whose father had lost his head on a revolutionary scaffold in 1794, and who himself had fought among the Vendéans; elected from Blois to the "Chambre Introuvable" in 1815, he held that seat till 1830. He was in his day of no particular political importance, though a characteristic and respected figure, and was never in office; his tastes were literary and a large section of the editor's meagre introduction is occupied by a list of his very varied productions. The reader of the *Souvenirs* will not be surprised that none of these productions had previously been known to him; though a felicitous expression here and there and poetical effusions scattered throughout bear witness to the "esprit" with which Mme. de Staël credited him, the book is on the whole dreary reading.

In what degree does M. de Salaberry illustrate the opinions and passions of the Ultra-Royalists in the years 1821-30? The epoch to which the writer always looks back fondly is that of the "Chambre Introuvable," and he cannot forget or forgive its dismissal in 1816. Richelieu is for him a nincompoop, all his supporters fools or knaves; it is only with Charles X. that the good time comes fully in again. There could be no better illustration of the attitude toward the crown of the Ultra-Royalists than we have in M. de Salaberry's hysterical account of the coronation of Charles X. (I. 173-191). All Liberals are to him revolutionist, anti-monarchical, Carbonarist, made such simply by private passions and

¹ See editor's preface, pp. xii, xiii. The Count was referred to in a political squib of the time as "Don Quichotte Salaberry."

unholy ambitions. At times he falls into political disquisitions; one of the most instructive passages of this kind is that in which he discourses on Liberals and liberalism (without the capital, I. 199). The terms altar and throne are usually found together in his pages; opponents of the monarchical supremacy are *ipso facto* atheists; government is effective just in proportion to its identification of the interests of Church and State. He is a strong supporter of all the distinctive Ultra-Royalist measures of the Villèle period, and a bitter opponent of the press; he condemns the removal of the censure at the beginning of the reign of Charles X. and advises the government to make use of its exceptional powers to punish the courts for not condemning journals.

In this intolerance of public opinion our author deviates from the anti-Villèle Ultras, for the simple reason that he is Ministerialist and they are in opposition. It is necessary to keep in mind the split in the Royalist ranks that became pronounced in the new Chamber of 1824; the dismissal of Chateaubriand and Bellune from the ministry converted a latent hostility to Villèle into active opposition, and from this time on these "Royalistes de la Défection" attacked Villèle and his measures on every occasion. This opposition was undoubtedly factious and unprincipled: but it is evident that Salaberry in his condemnation of it (almost as marked a feature of the *Souvenirs* as hatred of the Liberals) is equally impelled by personal influences. His positions differed in no important degree from the extreme Ultra ones, and he repeatedly urges measures fully as unwise and arbitrary as those finally adopted. He continues loyal to Villèle to the end. The Martignac administration he condemns as one of concessions by which only the revolutionists profited, while that of Polignac, while monarchical and religious, is weak and disunited (II. 276, 284).

The divergence of M. de Salaberry as a close adherent of Villèle from the party with which he is really in sympathy, brings him into some difficulties and inconsistencies, especially in connection with the Spanish war. But perhaps it is not particularly profitable to dwell on the vagaries of this weak-headed and narrow-spirited, though undoubtedly upright and gallant gentleman. On the whole it would seem that his admiring posterity were ill-advised in permitting his paper to go to publication in this form, and that we need not be moved by any acute sense of gratitude for their oversight.

VICTOR COFFIN.

Russia and the Russians. By EDMUND NOBLE. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1900. Pp. 285.)

MR. NOBLE is one of the very few American writers who have attempted to make a serious study of Russia, present and past, and we hail him as such. To be sure, the fact that he is the author of *The Russian Revolt* and the correspondent of *Free Russia* will in itself suggest the likelihood of certain limitations to his capacity as an historian. It is not, however, a history strictly speaking that he has tried to give us in

his latest work ; it is rather a series of connected sketches, in thirteen chapters, "The Land and the People," "Laying the Foundations," "How Russia Became an Autocracy," etc. This method may have the advantage of enabling him to disregard any lack of proportion between his different topics and of allowing a more rhetorical treatment ; but, as a result, the book is neither one thing nor the other. It has not the structure of a good short history, and there are far too many primary facts for a series of essays. The scholar will find nothing in it particularly useful, and no method can excuse some of the inaccuracies.

Mr. Noble seems to have meant to write carefully. He has used excellent authorities and evidently has wished to be studiously moderate, though continually indulging in sweeping statements. His belief that "We are thus entitled to regard the autocratic régime in Russia as maintained not in the interest of the people but in the interest of a ruling class" does not very often crop up to vitiate his impartiality, especially in the earlier part of his work. As one would expect, like most other western liberals, he is not fair to the national Greek Orthodox Church, or to its source, the Byzantine Empire. His broad style of narration, too, leads him to treat controverted and even very doubtful facts as if they were generally accepted truths, as for instance when he calls the princess Tarakánov (p. 91) the daughter of the man he dubs Alexander Alexei Gregorovich Razumovsky (a piling up of names utterly impossible in Russian), and of the Empress Elizabeth. Again, his love of the picturesque makes him forget in the enthusiasm of his description of the baptism of Vladimir's followers (p. 28) that the ceremony took place in the Dnieper not the Volkhov, *i. e.*, near Kiev not Novgorod, in southern not northern Russia.

To continue our fault-finding, it is hardly worth while to note an occasional misplaced accent or questionable transcription ; what we have to criticize is the inaccuracy of many of Mr. Noble's facts. For instance he exaggerates the isolating influence of the language in cutting off Russia from the west. Russian is not harder than Polish, nor is it a non-European language like Hungarian ; and even the use of a different script was not such a serious barrier from the rest of the world. Any one can learn the modern simpler Russian alphabet in half an hour. It is a little astonishing, moreover, to find an author who really knows so much about Russia still believing the absurdity (p. 81) that the Urals were "the boundaries thus apparently marked out for them by nature." The Urals are less of a natural boundary than are the Alleghanies. If Mr. Noble had read Cahun's *Turcs et Mongols* he would scarcely have repeated the old fable of "the enormous numerical superiority" of the Tartars (p. 47), and his statement that "in 1480, the power of the Asiatics was finally brought to an end by Iván the Terrible," is to say the least very confusing. Iván III., whom this must mean, was given the name of the "Terrible," but he is always known as the "Great" and the term "Terrible" has become indissolubly linked with his grandson Iván IV. Utterly unpardonable indeed, are such errors as making

Mikháil Románov a descendant of Iván (p. 65), and as saying (p. 161) that Alexéi Mikháilovich intrusted the work of revising the sacred books to Maxim the Greek (who lived a full century earlier), and that serfdom was instituted about the middle of the seventeenth century, whereas the decisive steps were taken in 1597. The mention (p. 88) of "the struggle with the Turks (1736-1739), peace with whom Anna after losing 100,000 men obtained through the mediation of France," does not convey a correct impression of a war where the Russian arms met with nearly uniform success even if the treaty of peace was unsatisfactory. For what possible reason in the previous sentence is Augustus II. called "Auguste"? He was not a Frenchman, but a German named "August," which is also the Polish way of spelling the name. Finally let us charitably assume that it was a slip of the pen which caused (p. 118) Constantine and Nicholas to be described as the sons instead of the brothers of Alexander I. As for the last chapter, "The Future of Russia," its various conclusions and prophecies need not detain us.

ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE.

Surveys, Historic and Economic. By W. J. ASHLEY, M.A., Professor of Economic History in Harvard University. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1900. Pp. xxvii, 476.)

To those who have followed Mr. Ashley's scattered contributions to the periodicals, this collection of his minor writings will bring little that is unfamiliar. About two-thirds of its contents have appeared in various economic journals. One-half the remainder is from the pages of *The Nation* or *THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*. Less than one-eighth of the whole is now printed for the first time. The subjects treated range from "English Serfdom" to "Harvard Scholarships," and from "The Canadian Sugar Combine" to "The Tory Origin of Free Trade." But the book, in spite of its superficial diversities, has elements of essential unity. It is informed by a vigorous personality, it is dominated by definite convictions, and it faces in the direction in which much historical work is now looking. "We who concern ourselves with economic history," declares the author, "have with us the current of the world's thought." The period of constitution-making which followed the French Revolution produced its political historians, its Guizots and Hallams and Grotes. The centuries following the Reformation show an imposing procession of historians of the Church. "Precisely in the same way the pressure of modern economic problems is certain to produce, has already begun to produce, a whole literature of economic history." Of the extent and character of much of this literature, Mr. Ashley's *Surveys* afford a good indication. Out of his forty-five articles over thirty are reviews—some of them elaborate reviews—of recent works dealing with economic history. Indeed not more than ten of the whole number appear to be altogether independent of some specific book.

The essays and reviews thus brought together Mr. Ashley has arranged in eight "well-marked groups" entitled: (1) Preliminaries (already

quoted from—these include his inaugural lecture at Harvard), (2) Medieval Agrarian, (3) Medieval Urban, (4) Economic Opinion, (5) England and America, 1660-1760, (6) Industrial Organization, (7) Biographical, (8) Academic. As might have been expected the medieval sections are by far the largest. They occupy together nearly half the volume, the three following sections filling two-thirds of the remainder. Broadly speaking, the first of them, the "Medieval Agrarian" section, is concerned with the mark. Its opening essay, on "English Serfdom," surveys the external history of the "mark dogma" down to the appearance of Vinogradoff's *Villainage in England*; and the subsequent progress of knowledge upon that and related subjects is indicated by a baker's dozen of brief reviews. The essay itself exhibits the author at his best. It is clearly thought and persuasively written. The general reader is likely to be left with scarcely more doubt where the truth lies than is felt by Mr. Ashley himself; and as to the mark, at least, Mr. Ashley's convictions are positive. But the same reader will probably wish that the author had worked into his essay what is important in the following reviews, instead of printing them at length. Iterated disbelief, even in the Teutonic freeman, becomes wearisome. Mr. Ashley has hit the hypothetical head of that worthy wherever he saw it. He has hit hard and straight; and it is, perhaps, poor-spirited not to share his *gaudium certaminis*. But after all, why march us up and down among the slain? Why should not the author act upon his own conviction (p. 166) that "since the appearance of M. Fustel de Coulanges' detailed examination of von Maurer's alleged authorities the mark doctrine . . . ought to be too dead to be longer attacked"?—especially since it is not clear that even Maitland has shaken his confidence in the servile origin of the manor.

In form, the "Medieval Urban" group is like its predecessor. But the ten reviews which follow its introductory essay on "The Beginnings of Town Life in the Middle Ages," do not produce the same impression of possible superfluity, because Mr. Ashley is here content to offer a clear and impartial survey of recent theories as to the origin of medieval towns, without giving in his own adherence to any one of them.

The section entitled "Economic Opinion" consists, in addition to two brief reviews, of an admirable article on "The Tory Origin of Free Trade"; it shows convincingly that Sir Dudley North and the other eighteenth-century pamphleteers in whose "liberal" doctrines McCulloch found evidence of preternatural enlightenment, were, in fact, merely playing the game of politics against the Whig prohibition of 1678, and were by no means free traders in the "orthodox" sense—than which nothing more illuminating has been written on economic opinion in eighteenth-century England.

The next section opens with a lecture on "The Colonial Legislation of England and the American Colonies" which was delivered before the University of Oxford in January, 1899, and published in *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* for November of the same year. It argues that the grievances inflicted upon the colonists by the Acts of Trade have been

greatly exaggerated. The Navigation Laws proper protected colonial shipping and ship-building quite as much, and restricted them no more, than they did English. The laws requiring that "enumerated commodities" be exported to England only, and those forbidding certain manufactures in the colonies, worked no real hardship, because they jumped with the economic conditions then prevailing. Our products were chiefly agricultural, and for these we found a ready sale in England. We had neither the capital, the labor, nor the technical knowledge necessary to establish manufactures. In these respects the commercial relations of England and America would not have been much different if there had been no Acts of Trade at all. Even the Act of 1663, requiring that commodities the growth or manufacture of Europe be shipped to the colonies only from England and in English bottoms, did not hamper the Americans, since England was their natural entrepôt.

To this last pleading a demurrer was promptly filed by a critic who conceded the other points.¹ In his view Mr. Ashley's is an *à priori* argument, and must fall before the abundant evidence of illicit trade in the colonies. Against his attack Mr. Ashley now defends his position in a paper on "American Smuggling, 1660-1760." He admits the weakness of the original *à priori* argument, and seeks to strengthen it by pointing out that "American imports from England, far from diminishing when the War of Independence was over—as we should expect if the obligation to buy in England had been a serious grievance—actually increased" (p. 344). They did so. According to the official figures they amounted, on a six years' average ending in 1792, to £2,807,306 against only £2,216,824 on a six years' average ending in 1774. But the absolute amount is less significant than the rate of increase. These figures show a growth of less than 28 per cent. in eighteen years. If now we compare the value of goods imported on a ten years' average ending in 1730, with those imported on a ten years' average ending in 1710, we find an increase of 76 per cent. in twenty years. Similarly for 1740 of 81 per cent., for 1750 of 72 per cent., for 1760 of 139 per cent., for 1770 of 113 per cent. Thus it appears that imports from England still increased after the Revolution, but at a diminished rate. If the figures warrant any inference at all (which may be doubted), it is that Americans bought less and not more goods in England after the war than they might have done had they remained subject to the Acts of Trade. The figures, then, seem rather to weaken than to strengthen the *à priori* argument.

Mr. Ashley next takes up the illicit trade itself. Here he draws needed distinctions between that which was, and that which was not, in violation of the Acts of Trade. We must eliminate: (1) trade with pirates and in violation of the East Indian Company's monopoly, (2) supplies sold to the King's enemies in time of war, and (3) smuggling to evade colonial tariffs (all three being forms of trade as illegal for Englishmen as for colonists) in order to find the residue which alone can

¹ A. H. Johnson, in *Economic Journal*, 96.

be cited as evidence of the oppressive character of the Acts of Trade. It is impossible in a review to follow Mr. Ashley into the detailed consideration from which he concludes that their residue was small. He devotes most space to the apparent confirmation of his conclusions by Lord Sheffield's *Observations on the Commerce of the American States* (first ed., 1783, sixth, 1784). Now Sheffield was opposed to a treaty with the United States. So he asserted that England would hold the trade of the Americans without it. His reason was that the Americans could not buy what they wanted on better terms of any other nation. This he attempted to prove by taking up the various articles severally, making abundant use of such phrases as "a great," "very great," "inconsiderable," "not of capital amount." But, with one exception, to be noted presently, he gives no figures. To call him in amounts to little more than saying that somebody else, and that a person not free from suspicion of political interest, had anticipated Mr. Ashley's *à priori* argument. The argument is, perhaps, somewhat strengthened by Sheffield's authority, but it is by no means rendered conclusive. It still remains true, as Mr. Ashley says, that the point at issue cannot be settled "until the economic history of New England [and the other colonies] has been subjected to a more thorough and scholarly investigation than it has yet received" (p. 337), for here, as in nearly all departments of international trade, it is a question of relative values, of the *proportion* [author's italics] of the illicit importation of European goods to the total importation" (p. 341). And on this crucial question Sheffield gives us one, and but one bit of precise information. In the years 1767-1770 nineteen per cent. of English exports to the colonies were commodities of foreign origin, over eleven per cent. of the whole being East Indian, and less than eight per cent., presumably, European goods. Mr. Ashley quotes the figures in a foot-note, apparently regarding them as a measure of the colonists' small demand for European goods. But they might also be interpreted as indicating the extent to which such goods were smuggled direct.

The three remaining sections of the book are predominantly not historical. The volume is handsomely printed, in clear type, upon paper which, though surprisingly light in weight, is opaque, of a pleasant dead finish, and takes ink admirably. The table of contents is very full, but that by no means atones for the absence of an index.

CHARLES H. HULL.

History of the New World Called America. By EDWARD JOHN PAYNE, Fellow of University College, Oxford. Vol. II. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1899. Pp. xxviii, 604.)

THE second volume of Payne's *History* is entirely devoted to an ethnographic account of the aborigines, or, as they are now termed by anthropologists, the Amerinds. The opening pages contain an essay upon military organization and advancement and the creation of an

industrial class. Missionary civilization is shown to rest, "like all else within the scope of history," upon a solid economic basis. The origin of the industrial class is accounted for by universal laws and not by the difference in individual aptitude. By two methods, both depending upon the primal condition of servitude of woman, the industrial class is evolved. Evidence is adduced to show that agricultural communities composed exclusively of women existed in both worlds and the tales of Amazons are not fiction but authentic tradition. Increase in population results as a natural physiological process after the assumption of the tasks of agriculture by the males. In Mexico and Peru the contrast between the ruling military class and the laborers is strongly marked, agricultural advancement depending upon and developing with military efficiency. The warrior class is a survival from savagery, the industrial class is a new creation. Even in their religious notions there is separation; the warrior class concentrate their devotion upon the atmospheric powers and the heavenly bodies while the popular religion is an earth-worship. In general we may say that there is very little of the "New World" in the first thirty-five pages of the volume.

The unit of aboriginal history is assumed to be the pueblo, corresponding in a measure to the village community of the Old World; but unlike it the pueblo was a purely agricultural community, the Amerinds having no domestic animals save the llama. The pueblo is described as the seat of an agricultural tribe, but the definition of a tribe is very unsatisfactory; the author might have used with profit the publications of the Bureau of American Ethnology relating to the tribe, clan and gens. After contrasting the political organization of Peru and Mexico, the conclusion is reached that the Mexican dominant pueblo, existing by despotic military power, more nearly approached the feudal system of the Old World than any other government in America. The food-quest is made the foremost cause of migration, and property is interpreted in terms of food. The first migration was from Asia over the "miocene bridge" by means of which there is believed to have been a considerable migration to and fro of the lower mammals. During the Glacial Period the passage to the New World gradually became more difficult, though the land bridge was broadened to include the whole area of Behring Sea. So remote was the time of the first peopling of America that the Amerinds have developed a uniform physical type with only such variations here and there as may be ascribed to the effects of local environment. Mr. Payne has his fling at the science of craniology, quoting from authorities antedating by some years the advance in our knowledge of ethnic anatomy and ignoring the recent valuable publications based upon it. He continually uses the term "physiology" in the sense of anatomy.

Evidence of ethnologic unity of the Amerinds is sought in their language. The method of procedure is the sound one of comparing the forms of languages not their actual substance, the particular sounds of which they consist. The attempts that have been made to prove Jewish, Greek, Turanian and other "affinities" are briefly described and the

futility of such researches shown by a forceful exposition of the instability of language. The subject of language is treated with unusual fulness, about two-fifths of the volume being devoted to it, the greater part of which might have been written if the Amerindian languages had never been known. Though it is stated that the history of speech as here traced probably could not have been recovered from the Turanian, either alone or in connection with any other group of the Old World, yet the personal basis of objective speech is emphasized and the fact pointed out that syntax is an essential function of mind. The oralization of the primitive human cry is regarded as the result of the assumption of the erect posture which necessitated eating with erected head. The development of grammar from the crude holophrase has proceeded along the same lines in American and Turanian but the American languages represent the lower stages.

A very complete account of the American calendar systems is given and the evidence ably marshalled to show that they are of independent origin. The Mexican calendar has been regarded as a very perfect device which by intercalations and corrections accommodated itself to the true course of the sun. Payne maintains that no corrections whatever were made.

In tracing the general migrations of the principal stocks of the North American continent the centre of distribution is placed on the northwest coast. Thence the Eskimos spread to the northward; the Algonquins toward the east and south; the Athapascans north and south; the Nahuatlacâ down into Mexico. Furthermore, the Mexicans are declared to be clearly related in culture to the Kwakiutls and others of the Northwest. The Mayas are regarded as the descendants of the Toltecs and hence an off-shoot of the Nahuatlacâ. The Toltecs themselves are highly praised for their achievements in the industrial and esthetic arts: they are termed the Greeks of the New World. The Dresden codex is considered the principal one of those to be ascribed to the Toltecs, and throughout this the "Man of the Sun" so largely predominates that it is denominated by Payne the "Book of Quetzalcohuatl." The codex conveys an impression of the god's attributes and history together with the Toltec conception of human advancement by successive stages, at least as far as their traditions revealed it. From the codices and from the early writers, many of whose publications are now rare, the pre-Columbian history of the Mexican pueblos is reconstructed and a detailed account given of their condition at the time of the Conquest. The conclusion is reached that their development was recent and tending toward the strengthening of the military despotism of Mexico. Tlacopan and Tezcuco were becoming mere dependencies of Mexico. The worst feature of Mexican life was the almost continuous cannibal carnival, which was ostensibly to procure victims for sacrifice, but in reality to provide animal food for the privileged class; this is to be regarded as one of the results of the absence of large animals capable of furnishing labor power and food.

In Peru the llama furnished animal food, and the customs developed in herding this animal were continued in herding the inferior tribes whom the Incas conquered. The governing tribes are brought from the southeast and the subject tribes from the east and north, some of them by sea. The limits of the Aymará and Quichua languages are given and the fact noted that both arose from the same stock. Notwithstanding the fact that the Peruvians had developed pictographs and systems of writing to a much less extent than the Mexicans, nevertheless reliable evidences of Inca history existed at the time of the Conquest which verify their oral traditions in a remarkably clear and complete manner. The character and influence of the eleven pre-Spanish Incas are described in detail, together with an excellent presentation of the characteristics of the Inca political system. In the final comparison of the Mexican and Peruvian cultures Payne terms the Incas brutal and sanguinary tyrants "compared with whom the cannibal chiefs of Anahuac appear almost in the light of polished and civilized rulers." In general the Peruvian culture was of a lower grade than the Mexican. The people were lower in mental cultivation if not absolutely inferior in mental capacity. However, the Peruvian culture was presumably much more recent. The history of the conquest of Peru is reserved for the next volume.

Two features of this book are strikingly prominent: it is a philosophic essay rather than an ethnographic description of the Amerinds, and it emphasizes those phases of Amerindian culture which are unique and hence important in the building up of arguments in support of the theory of development of language or institutions. Naturally 548 pages do not permit a very complete account of a race nor does the author attempt to deal, except in the most general manner, with the majority of American stocks. The volume is provided with a very complete table of contents with corresponding marginal titles, but there are no chapter divisions or interruptions of the text from the first page to the last. Many rare publications are cited but we cannot avoid the impression that portions of the volume would have been improved by adherence to more modern authorities.

FRANK RUSSELL.

History of America before Columbus, according to Documents and Approved Authors. By P. DE ROO. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1900. Pp. 1, 613; xxiii, 613.)

THESE handsome volumes are a monument alike of the author's industry, and of his utter lack of the historic sense. In fact the work must be looked at not so much as a history, as a polemic in support of the claim that there are to be found in America "vestiges of a Christianity, which evidently was not introduced by the relatively late Northmen;" and as an extended narrative of the early Roman Catholic missions to Greenland. The questions of the origin and antiquity of man upon this continent, the claim that America was known to the ancient Greeks and

Romans, and the alleged many early voyages to these shores, are all discussed at great length, but in a spirit of mingled dogmatism and credulity which sadly interferes with any proper judicial weighing of the authorities cited.

The author states that the work has grown out of the labors of years in searching the Vatican Secret Archives "to obtain reliable information regarding the history of one of the Roman pontiffs, Alexander VI., who is as much slandered as he is little known." The only real contribution to knowledge we have found in the work, consists in an appendix of about one hundred pages, comprising twenty-two documents from the Vatican archives, nine from the Lateran Archives, and nine from various libraries in Rome, all relating to the early Greenland missions.

Perhaps the best indication of the spirit in which the work is conceived may be given by simply quoting the titles of some of its chapters: "The Bible known in ancient America;" "Christ and his Cross known in ancient America;" "Baptism and Holy Eucharist known in ancient America." It is difficult to take seriously vagaries such as these, and we do not believe they will be countenanced by sober-minded historical students belonging to the same religious persuasion as the author. His liberal conception of what constitutes evidence may be inferred from his suggestion that there "be established a continental museum of American antiquities" to contain "ancient crucifixes, crosses and Christian books and relics discovered, *or yet to be discovered*, in our hemisphere" (I. 456); or from his expectation that "some Saga speaking of these countries, *i. e.*, S. E. Greenland, may yet be found" (II. 441); or from his acceptance of the childish fable that Latin books were found in the king's library in the Estotiland of the Zeni (*i. e.*, the New England states, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia) (II. 267).

We will merely attempt to select a few nuggets as samples of the wonderful discoveries in ancient history to be found in these remarkable volumes. We are told that "the Mound-Builders' voyages across the Atlantic were rather from West to East than in the opposite direction . . . and that the Danish mounds are venerable monuments testifying to another discovery and partial settlement of the Old World by an American nation" (I. 81). These "discoveries of Europe by ancient Americans, if their numerous landings on European soil could be titled with this misnomer" are much insisted upon (I. 172). We are assured that "the aboriginal inhabitants of our hemisphere have not till this day received their meed for ancient bravery, nautical skill, and wonderful attainments in geography, and in every branch of material advancement, and of civilization generally" (I. 173). We are further instructed regarding the very early beginnings of civilization upon this continent, which "were brought into America by the nearest descendants of the patriarch Noe, who had taken their course in an easterly direction, landing in America, either at Behring Strait or, after sailing through Polynesia, on the Western coast of Central America and Peru, as is plainly intimated by the ancient monuments of those countries" (I. 191). So

far as the introduction of Christianity is concerned, we are told that "while there are to be found in America some prehistoric vestiges that point to the apostle St. Thomas's presence" (I. 217), yet this "is not absolutely proved; while on the contrary there are no arguments wanting to make us believe that the origin of the vestiges of Christianity, still existing on the continent at the beginning of the sixteenth century, is not anterior to the sixth or seventh century of our era" (I. 524).

Plato's Atlantis is duly accepted by our author as an historical narrative, but he has doubts about the significance of the discovery of Fusang by Buddhist monks, in the fifth century, although referring to Charles G. Leland's book on this subject as the work of an *Englishman* (I. 339). He also defends the alleged Bull of Gregory IV., in the year 835, as proving "the discovery and partial Christianization of Greenland, as well as of Iceland long before any exiled Northman first set foot on its shores" (II. 45). That these countries "were newly converted during the eleventh century is perfectly correct in regard to their Scandinavian inhabitants; but it does not disprove the fact of a previous Christian population placed by the Roman pontiff under the jurisdiction of St. Ansgar" (II. 67). The name "Greenland," according to our author, is derived not from the familiar statement in the Icelandic sagas that it was given to a newly-discovered country by Eric the Red, A. D. 985, on account of its natural features, but from its resemblance to "Cronland," the island where Jupiter chained in everlasting sleep his conquered antagonist Cronos, or Saturn, according to the veracious narrative of Plutarch, in his treatise *On the Face in the Orb of the Moon* (II. 64).

Much space is devoted to an account of the discovery of Vinland by Leif Ericson, A. D. 1000, as narrated in the Sagas, which in our author's opinion are neither mythical nor vague, and which are confirmed, he thinks, by other historical sources. But certainly his statement that it was not "recorded in writing at once," but was "for the space of *one or two generations* faithfully preserved by the Icelandic professional sagamen or story-tellers" (II. 289) is very wide of the truth. The shortest period to which such a tradition has ever been reduced is three hundred years.¹

Archaeological evidence of the presence of the Northmen upon this continent abounds, in our author's view. Professor Horsford's discovery of "Norumbega," the ancient seaport of Vinland, with all its basins, wharves, docks and canals, at Watertown, in Massachusetts, is ardently maintained, and Longfellow's *Skeleton in Armor* is made to "speak" once more; but the Dighton Rock and the Old Stone Mill at Newport, R. I., are given up. Not so, however, is the inscription upon a rock on the banks of the Potomac over the grave of Syasi the Blonde, in which were found fragments of bones and two Byzantine coins, "all of which interesting articles are now preserved in the Smithsonian Institution, at Washington" (II. 322), notwithstanding the fact that Professor Joseph Henry, the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, so long ago as

¹ Reeves, *The Finding of Wineland the Good*, p. 23.

March, 1869, exposed the hoax and disclosed the author of it in the *Historical Magazine*. Equal faith is reposed in the mythical equestrian statue, erected on the summit of Corvo in the Madeira Islands, and the author inquires "Was the statue erected as a guide to point out to other northern sea-rovers and to Columbus the route to follow to the centre of the New World?" (II. 323).

There are some strange blunders in New England geography, such as "Kent county, Massachusetts," and "the city of Rutland, Massachusetts" (II. 313), and we are sceptical about "honey-dew," such as Leif gathered in abundance, being yet distilled in the island of Nantucket (II. 218); and that in the Black Death, A. D. 1347, "in the city of London only fourteen persons survived" (II. 414).

We will conclude with one other erroneous statement: "Claudian, a poet, tells, in the year 390, that the Emperor Theodosius had frightened the far distant isle (Thule) with the sound of his Getish wars" (II. 520). The truth is that Theodosius, the great general (father of the emperor of the same name), A. D. 370, repelled the attacks of the Picts and the Scots upon Britain, and it is this to which Claudian refers.

In view of the flood of light our author has shed upon the ancient history of this continent, we look forward with much interest to his forthcoming work, in which he intends to "prove that Alexander VI. was too great and disinterested a character to be thrown among his Italian officials and not become aspersed by their reviving paganism" (II. 464, note).

H. W. H.

The Transit of Civilization from England to America in the Seventeenth Century. By EDWARD EGGLESTON, Author of *The Beginners of a Nation*. (New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1901. Pp. x, 344.)

THE full title of Dr. Eggleston's book is hardly lucid; the abridged form of it which appears on the cover—"The Transit of Civilization"—is obscure; and only the reverse of the leaf which precedes the title-page informs us that the work forms part of his "History of Life in the United States." Carping though critical mention of such details may seem, these details are the first which come to mind when one considers the total effect of the book in question. The indefiniteness of the titles proves unfortunately characteristic of the chapters which they name. As a whole, for all their interesting passages, these are confused, bewildering and sometimes misleading.

Yet Dr. Eggleston's subject is not only interesting but important. His purpose was to set forth the precise state of European civilization at the time when our country was finally settled, to explain the mental and moral condition of the generation which implanted itself in American soil, and in some degree to point out how the pristine ideas and ideals, convictions and errors, of our national ancestry have affected our national

growth and character. In setting about this work he found that "there was little help in anything American" and that he "could not count on anything English;" that he must "build a description from the ground. The complex states of knowing and thinking, of feeling and passion, must be explained. The little world as seen by the man of the seventeenth century must be understood. Its sun, moon, and planets were flames of fire without gravity, revolved about the earth by countless angels; its God governed this one little world with mock majesty." And so his preface goes on, pleasantly and not very clearly, to tell how the range and diligence of his reading extended. The fact of his conscientious research is further attested, if attestation were needed, by copious marginal references, which make his pages frequently remind one of a folio Burton, and by the numerous and closely printed supplementary notes—"Elucidations" he prefers to name them—which follow each of his six chapters. Whatever Dr. Eggleston's limits, nobody can charge him with lack of industry.

If occasional and random tests can prove anything, furthermore, these references and notes are thoroughly trustworthy. When Dr. Eggleston gives you chapter and verse, and he gives them freely, you may thankfully and confidently accept his authority. And yet the final result of all this labor, which one would be so glad to praise without reserve, suggests rather than commendation a word of warning to all modern students and writers of history. It is an agreeable incidental reflection that such warning to men still young can be based on work which comes from a man so far from young in years; nothing could more surely imply that fresh youthfulness of spirit which groups Dr. Eggleston with some of our elder men of letters, whose natures to the end rose above the impediments both of time and of infirmity. Assuming for the moment, then,—what anybody, if such body there be, who did not know Dr. Eggleston's name would instantly assume,—that this book may be held a fair example of contemporary writing, one cannot point out too clearly that human minds, like human stomachs, vary indefinitely in their power of digestion. Each man's limit of acquisition each man must learn for himself; but no man who desires to produce anything more individual than a compilation can afford to take into his head at any given time more information than he can handle with vigorous intellectual energy. The analogy of physical indigestion is variously close; at sympathetic moments the mental state of modern students, turned loose to browse amid all the riches of modern libraries, seems painfully like the plethoric inconveniences which disturb healthy boys toward the end of Thanksgiving dinners.

To be more precise, the work which Dr. Eggleston undertook demanded not only such wide research as he has courageously persisted in, but also at least two supplementary processes. Which of the two is the more important need hardly be determined; both are essential. In the first place, the historian of a past civilization must somehow bring himself into imaginative sympathy with the human spirit of the times

with which he deals, until he understands not only bare facts but also how those facts made the living men feel who knew them in the flesh. In the second place, such an historian, availing himself of the perspective of time, must slowly grow to perceive the mutual relations of his facts not only to one another but also to so much of general history as comes within his vision. To take a casual example from our own times, a writer of three hundred years hence who should touch on the dancing of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries might draw surprising inferences, or leave such inferences to be drawn, from an accurate description of the waltz as the fashionable successor of the minuet. And no amount of detailed erudition, uncorrected by imaginative sympathy, and by general knowledge of social development, could easily avoid the conclusion that our own times have been deplorably less respectable than those of our great-grandparents,—which is far from what most of us believe to be the case.

How remote Dr. Eggleston is from imaginative sympathy with the past which he tries to revive may be inferred from that phrase of his preface which tells how the God of the seventeenth century “governed this one little world with mock majesty.” Perhaps so; anthropomorphism is doubtless out of credence as well as out of fashion. But the God of our emigrant fathers was the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, the God of the Psalmists and the Prophets; the God of the four Gospels which for ages were accepted as His living Word; the God of the Crusades and of the Reformation; the God to whose throne Foxe’s Martyrs rose ecstatic from the flames of Smithfield; the God whose Spirit sustained amid all the horrors of a savage wilderness the indomitable courage of the Pilgrims and of the Puritans; the God to whose service Cromwell gave himself; the God for whom the Ironside soldiery laid down their lives. They had their errors,—saints, apostles, prophets, martyrs, and the rest; but their widest error seems less than that of a modern historian who finds in the majesty of their Divinity even a tinge of mockery. Only those who can thrill with devout fervor as the words of the elder centuries begin to glow again with the life which once was in them can understand the spiritual truth wherein their formal misconceptions fade at last, like misty clouds in the fathomless blue of sunny skies.

Just such misleading lack of sympathy as that “mock majesty” seems to imply appears throughout Dr. Eggleston’s six chapters. The titles of these chapters incidentally indicate his second great fault—confused perception of the relations which the separate parts of his subject bear to one another. Here then are titles in turn: I. “Mental Outfit of the Early Colonists;” II. “Digression Concerning Medical Notions at the Period of Settlement”—though why this is any more digressive than the chapters which follow is not evident; III. “Mother English, Folk-Speech, Folk-Lore, and Literature;” IV. “Weights and Measures of Conduct;” V. “The Tradition of Education;” VI. “Land and Labor in the Early Colonies.” Again it may seem unfair to base criticism on

a mere table of contents ; this table, however, in its apparent lack of system—for the thread which binds it together, if there be one, is not evident, even to a careful reader,—really typifies the confusion of the whole book. The faint yet pervasive use of metaphor, too, freshly obscures meaning. So in the end it is not suprising that one lays down the *Transit of Civilization* with some misty impressions which very likely Dr. Eggleston never meant to make. To take at random a single one of these, he can hardly have intended to inform readers unlearned in the law that an ordinary method of conveying real property in old New England was unsupported livery of seisin. His researches must have brought him in sight, for example, of such things as the published volumes of Suffolk Deeds, and Thomas Lechford's Note-Book. To take another of these impressions, he can hardly have intended, at a time when state universities still maintain alternative schools of homoeopathic medicine, and educated people flock to seminaries of Christian Science, that we should serenely smile at the medical superstition of three centuries ago, as if all such superstition were dead and gone. And he must know that even to this day a knowledge of Latin proves, no one can tell why, the soundest basis for mental training. And so on. His confusion might seriously mislead.

But this is more than enough of fault-finding. Though the *Transit of Civilization* had deeper faults still, it would remain a book worth reading. As a collection of out-of-the-way and curious memoranda, suggesting all manner of discursive speculation, it has a quality and a charm which queerly group it in memory with Aubrey's *Miscellanies*, and Burton's *Anatomy*, and whatever other treasuries of oddity one may be fond of. It has over these, too, the advantage that its own references to authority may always be trusted and will often prove illuminating. Last and best of all, it really points the way to a kind of American history which in time may flood our past with revivifying light. For we shall never fully know ourselves until some imaginative, sympathetic historian, mature in power and reflection, shall have shown us, in semblance of its old vitality, what was the true mental and moral condition of our emigrant fathers, in their habit as they lived.

BARRETT WENDELL.

The Expansion of the American People, Social and Territorial. By EDWIN ERLE SPARKS, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of American History, The University of Chicago. (Chicago : Scott, Foresman and Co. 1900. Pp. 461.)

EVER since the north temperate coast of the western hemisphere began to be occupied by European settlers, population and civilization have been spreading westward. So important has this westward movement been, and so much more marked than the movement in any other direction, that it is a common-place observation. All that was ever needed to prove its existence was to state the relevant facts clearly ; and it does not

need any critical analysis or elaborate argument to prove that there have been some great impelling forces behind it. The forces may be difficult to identify. Perhaps some of them lie deep down in human nature among the other forces of involuntary human action. But however that may be, they have been as irresistible as they are unconscious, and as ceaseless as they are irresistible. It needs only a comparatively few carefully selected facts, skillfully interpreted and woven into a plain narrative, to make a convincing demonstration of their presence and their power; and when they are once admitted to exist what reason is there for believing that they would suddenly cease to operate when population reached the Pacific? Why should they not be expected to persist and to cause the restless pioneer to overleap barriers, northward or southward, eastward or westward, over seas or wherever else there are lands unoccupied by an equally vigorous population and culture?

In the book under review, Professor Sparks has told how population and culture have been carried from Europe to America and from the Atlantic to the Pacific by the people who have become pre-eminently the "American people;" and he has shown also how the same forces that have carried them over this region have by logical necessity launched them upon a colonial career.

The author is evidently an assiduous investigator in the highways and byways of history. He is also a believer in illustrative material. His book abounds in outline maps and photographic reproductions of title-pages, broadsides, advertisements, objects and scenes of historical interest. In the text he has sought with a few data to give a general effect; and has avoided the effort to be exhaustive in the enumeration of details. The book does not give the local history of the settlement of Virginia, or Ohio, or Kansas, or California. It is a monograph, and not a long one, on the "Expansion of the American People." Nineteen pages are allowed for bringing the narrative down to the period of American colonization; one hundred and twenty-two carry it on through the consideration of the "Pioneer life in the Ohio Valley;" fifty are devoted to the "Rounding out of the Gulf Possessions" and the "Assimilation of the Frontier French Elements;" seventy to the period from the beginning of "The Oregon Expansion" to the completion of a "Transcontinental Railroad;" and other chapters are devoted to "The National Seat of Government," "The Cumberland Road and the Erie Canal" and to American intellectual life, reforms and utopias.

Often what the narrative omits and what it contains are equally unconventional even if not always in accord with the reader's taste and judgment. Less space is given to the arguments made in Congress against the annexation of Louisiana than to the public ridicule incurred by Jefferson through his credulous belief in the existence of a huge mountain of rock salt in the new territory. The Indian wars of St. Clair and Wayne are treated of in a foot-note of six lines; but half a page is filled with typical songs of the Ohio flat-boat-men. The arguments for and against internal improvements are curtly treated; but the information, that between

1806 and 1838 sixty separate appropriations aggregating \$6,821,246, were made for the Cumberland road alone, is made to speak forcibly of the general determination of the people to have internal improvements at national expense. Thus amusing incident and significant fact, both alike gleaned from researches in the original sources, jostle against each other. Some of the expected topics are crowded out and the literary style shows departure from the sober vein of conventional historical composition.

In brief, the book contains, first, a number of significant facts not before used; secondly, considerable excellent illustrative material; and thirdly, a general but pretty definite impression of the irresistible expansion of the American people.

Of minor criticisms two only can be mentioned here. One concerns the interpretation (not peculiar to Sparks) of Jefferson's recommendation that Congress should "do *sub silentio* what shall be found necessary" to complete the acquisition of Louisiana. It must be interpreted in the light of Jefferson's proposed solution of the impending dilemma: first, secure the transfer of the territory so that France, if she should repent of her bargain, as it was feared, should repent in vain; secondly let Congress and the people freely and soberly consider whether and how they will heal the *ultra vires* action of a "guardian" government, done "beyond the constitution." What Jefferson expected was a positive act of ratification, not a decision by default that there had been no action *ultra vires*. (Cf. *Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Ford, VIII. 244-245, notes).

The illustration on p. 295 of "A Western Mission" suggests the inquiry whether these massive stone buildings erected at Nashota, Wisconsin, by the Protestant Episcopal Church for the education of the Indians, are a typical western mission, and whether the influence of the great home missionary societies, those excellent institutions through which the East subsidized the religious work on the Frontier, does not deserve a comprehensive treatment.

FREDERICK W. MOORE.

A Literary History of America. By BARRETT WENDELL, Professor of English at Harvard College. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. 574.)

READERS who are familiar with Professor Wendell's other books will open his *Literary History of America* with the expectation that, whatever else it may or may not be, it will be at least interesting and suggestive. They will not be disappointed. The book is readable from beginning to end, and its point of view is often novel and stimulating. In its total effect it differs essentially from any other work on the same subject.

Rightly to understand the book it is necessary, first of all, to get a clear idea of its purpose and method. It is not a complete, detailed history of American literature, and evidently is not intended to be. In Book

I., dealing with the seventeenth century, the literature of all but the New England colonies is dismissed with a word, and of the New England writers only Wigglesworth, Anne Bradstreet, and Cotton Mather receive specific treatment. In Book II., the only eighteenth-century authors who get more than passing mention are Edwards, Franklin, Dwight (whose longest poem, "The Conquest of Canaan," is not named), Trumbull, Barlow and Freneau. In the remaining four books, which fill nearly four hundred pages, although the principal writers of the nineteenth century are each discussed at some length, the biographical details are meagre and the writings are not examined or even named with any attempt at system or completeness. A rather capricious list of "Authorities and References" does something to make up for the lack elsewhere of bibliographical detail.

A complete history of American literature then, the book is not. It cannot be used as such; it should not be judged as such. Professor Wendell would probably say that he had no occasion to do again what has already been done by others, and indeed he seems to have made no special study of our colonial and Revolutionary literature or of the minor writers of the republic. What he has given us, instead, is a series of vivacious though rather sketchy essays upon the broad facts and tendencies of American literature, with special reference to the relation of that literature to English life and literature. The essays find their unity and novelty in a thesis which is maintained throughout the book, to-wit, that by reason of our "national inexperience," or the absence of "the struggling complexity of social and political forces in densely populated regions," Americans preserved for two centuries and more a good deal of the "spontaneity, enthusiasm, and versatility" of their Elizabethan ancestors while Englishmen during the same period were rapidly developing new types of national character. In this way Professor Wendell accounts for the fact that, in spite of fundamental unity of blood, language, law, and moral ideals, the two great divisions of the English-speaking race have become so distinct and at times have been so estranged. The Revolution, for instance, "sprang from a deep temperamental misunderstanding between the native English and their American compatriots;" "while under the influence of European conditions the English temperament had steadily altered from that of spontaneous, enthusiastic, versatile Elizabethans to that of stubborn, robust John Bull, the original American temper, born under Elizabeth herself, had never deeply changed." But our author does not forget that his chief business is with the literature. His constant method, therefore, is to sketch the salient features of English history and character in the century then under consideration, show that English literature of the period reflected the national temper, sketch American history and character in the same period, and then show that the differences (in kind, not in merit) between the two literatures were due to the persistence in America of an earlier type of Englishman. Thus he says of Cotton Mather's *Magnalia* that "it groups itself not with such work as Dryden's, but rather with such earlier work as that of Fuller or even of

Burton." Of the Revolutionary political pamphlets he says that although they "were phrased in the style of the eighteenth century," they "indicate in our country a kind of intellectual activity which in England had displayed itself most characteristically a hundred years earlier." And even in the case of writers so late as those of New England in the middle of the nineteenth century he maintains that "their spontaneous aptitude for idealism, their enthusiastic love for abstractions and for absolute truth, they had derived, too, from the Elizabethan Puritans whose traits they had hereditarily preserved."

The reader gets this thesis pretty well dinned into him before finishing the book; "national inexperience" and "Elizabethan spontaneity, enthusiasm, and versatility" become very familiar sounds in his ears—a little too familiar at last, so that he is set to wondering whether the iteration of a form of words is not being made to do duty for substantial proof; and one reader, at least, arose from his reading with the impression that although there is something in Professor Wendell's theory, and something worth emphasizing, yet that there is not so much in it as its propounder thinks. It over-states the Elizabethan qualities in the settlers of New England, and under-states their grimly Puritanic qualities. It exaggerates the similarity between the Elizabethans and the later Americans. In accounting for what similarity there was, it over-estimates the effect of heredity, and under-estimates the effect which climate, race-mixture, and social, economic, and political conditions may have had in developing spontaneity, enthusiasm, and versatility in individuals whose ancestors were not conspicuous for those Elizabethan qualities. It ignores the fact that in every generation there have been many Englishmen, particularly poets and men of letters, who were not of the John Bull type, and consequently it minimizes the effect of English literature, upon contemporary American literature. Lastly, the terms employed are necessarily so inexact, and the phenomena handled are so vast and complex, that the generalizations arrived at often do not admit of close application. In discussing the literature of the seventeenth century, for instance, Professor Wendell prudently omits to point out wherein the *Bay Psalm Book* and *The Day of Doom* exemplify Elizabethan spontaneity and versatility; enthusiasm they certainly show, but it is of the same grim kind that cut down the maypoles and closed the theatres. In the eighteenth century most of the pure literature, in verse and prose, is tamely imitative of Queen Anne models, not of Elizabethan. In his treatment of individual authors of the nineteenth century Professor Wendell is obliged to lay the emphasis upon their indebtedness to English eighteenth-century literature and to the European romanticism and idealism of their own day, although he returns to his theory in the Conclusion.

But the worth of the book does not depend wholly upon the truth of its central proposition. In connection with individual authors many remarks are made that are fresh and penetrating or at least suggestive. Much truth is happily summed up in these words: "Irving, imbued with nineteenth-century romantic temper, wrote in the classical style of the

century before ; Bryant, writing in the simply luminous style of his own century, expressed a somewhat formal sentimentality which had hardly characterized vital work in England for fifty years." Bryant's nature-poetry, however, particularly its relation to Wordsworth's, does not receive adequate treatment. Professor Wendell pierces close to the centre of the peculiar genius of Poe : "He had almost in perfection a power more frequently shown by skillful melodramatic actors than by men of letters—the power of assuming an intensely unreal mood and of so setting it forth as to make us for the moment share it unresistingly." The historical perspective in the following statement is illuminating : "The Yankee lecturers, of whom Emerson was the most eminent, were only half-secularized preachers—men who stood up and talked to ancestrally attentive audiences. . . . Emerson's essays, in short, prove to be an obvious development from the endless sermons with which for generations his ancestors had regaled the New England fathers." Professor Wendell's personal acquaintance with Lowell no doubt helped him to the insight here expressed : "One can feel in his literary temper two constant, antagonistic phases. His purity of taste was quite equal to Longfellow's ; particularly as he grew older, he eagerly delighted in those phases of literature which are excellent. Yet all the while he was incessantly impelled to whimsical extravagance of thought, feeling, and utterance." Original and striking, although not quite satisfying, is the likening of Holmes to Voltaire. Wholly just and admirable is the frequent insistence upon two general characteristics of American literature in the nineteenth century : its instinctive moral purity ; and its artistic conscience in matters of form, instead of the careless exuberance which might popularly be expected of literature in a young democracy. The forecast that "newspaper humor, the short stories of the magazines, and the popular stage seem the sources from which a characteristic American literature is most likely to spring," is at least not commonplace or superficial.

The ungracious task of mentioning certain positive faults may be performed rapidly. There are a good many errors, some of them hardly excusable, in matters of fact. What are now the concluding lines of "Thanatopsis" were not written when Bryant was seventeen but several years later ; yet the date here (p. 197) is a part of the argument. Poe (p. 205) at the time of his death was certainly on the way North after visiting his betrothed ; he was not left "in the gutter" but in a rumshop ; he did not "find" his way to the hospital but was taken there by an old friend. Whitman did not ramble about the country "much like those half-criminal wanderers whom we now call tramps" (p. 465) ; he went as a printer and journalist. John Esten Cooke's novel, *The Virginia Comedians* is referred to as "A Virginia Comedy" (p. 487), and the next sentence seems to distinguish it from "certain romances connected with his native state." Professor Wendell's style has a certain spontaneous vitality and freedom, but lacks conciseness, evenness and distinction ; "admirable," "once for all," "then," and "of course" are used so often that they become mannerisms. Statements, sometimes relatively unim-

portant ones, are carelessly repeated. The facetious passages are often cheap and clumsy and quite unworthy of the general level of the work. In general the form of the book is not sufficiently removed from that of the class-room lectures in which it first existed. It is unfortunate that in the many references to the social status of authors Professor Wendell has not always made it manifest that he mentions this matter merely for what light it may throw on the historical development of the literature, and not as a matter of any intrinsic consequence in that republic of letters where a palace is nothing, and a garret is nothing, but only the gift of genius from the Almighty.

After all has been said by way of adverse criticism, the fact remains that this *Literary History of America* is a fresh and original piece of work. It will doubtless strike some as cold and unsympathetic. But there is no need that all literary criticism should be emotionally sympathetic; it is even better that some should not be. There is, besides, such a thing as intellectual sympathy, and that is what we have here. The book as a whole is not rapturous and is not meant to be; in the case of several authors it is apparent, furthermore, that the historian does not find them especially congenial; but he is sincerely interested in the intellectual problems of American literature, particularly in the relations of it to the historical development of the entire English-speaking race. These problems are legitimate and interesting; and the book is so well done that it provokes the wish that in certain respects it had been done somewhat better.

WALTER C. BRONSON.

History and General Description of New France. By Rev. P. F. X. DE CHARLEVOIX, S.J. Translated from the Original Edition and edited with Notes by Dr. JOHN GILMARY SHEA, with a new Memoir and Bibliography of the Translator by Noah Farnham Morrison. In six volumes. Vol. I. (New York: Francis P. Harper. 1900. Pp. 286.)

ANYTHING relating to the Jesuits in North America finds favor just now with the publishers. The great edition of the *Relations* is about completed and this re-issue of Charlevoix is obviously intended to be placed side by side with the magnificent monument which Mr. Thwaites has reared for himself as editor. The edition, like that of the *Relations*, is limited to seven hundred and fifty copies. It may perhaps be doubted whether the work of the Jesuits is not in danger of being unduly magnified. Yet the historical student is not the one to complain of excess of light.

Charlevoix was pre-eminently the scholarly Jesuit of the first half of the eighteenth century. In 1720 he was sent out to New France to inspect the Jesuit missions. He went through the interior of the country, and then down the Mississippi to its mouth. He also visited San Domingo. About two years he thus spent in America, and in 1722 he re-

turned to Europe to pass the remaining half of life in various houses of the Jesuit order. He had access to valuable sources of information which he used with great industry, if not always with good judgment. To write the history of the New World became his ambition. Besides an account of New France, he wrote histories of San Domingo and of the famous Jesuit mission in Paraguay, which he depicts as a concrete realization of More's Utopia. Perhaps his history of Japan marks a survival still in the eighteenth century of the conceptions that associated America with the far East. Charlevoix's *New France* is of great value, though of course he is only a secondary authority for the greater part of the period which he covers. Considering the age he is fairly free from party passion, but he holds always a brief for the Jesuit order. He was too much the man of the world to have the simple credulity of some of his brethren, and his skilful sifting of authorities is an anticipation of the better historical work of our own day. Parkman however charged him with carelessness. He is sometimes prolix. This fault is more especially in evidence in the work on New France, yet it is a sound bit of history. He wrote in 1743, just before the first of the two wars broke out in which France's power in North America was overthrown, and it is pathetic to remember that he died in 1761, just when his country, whose colonizing efforts he had studied with such minute care, was overwhelmed by disaster in the new world. His book attracted immediate attention. Both German and English editions soon appeared, so that Dr. Shea had before him pioneers in the work of translation. Dr. Shea himself is too well and too honorably known as an historical scholar of the first rank for any tribute to his memory here. The memoir prefixed to this edition is no adequate recognition of his fame—the bibliography alone having any real value.

There is danger in reprinting a translation such as this with the translator's original notes unchanged. Dr. Shea wrote more than thirty years ago. Since that time a whole generation of scholars has worked upon the history of European effort in North America. The best of Parkman's work has been completed. Mr. Justin Winsor's great history has appeared. M. de Rochemonteix has given us his history of the Jesuits, and the band of enquirers into the early history of European discovery, among whom M. Harris stands pre-eminent, have added enormously to our knowledge. Not only therefore, in this edition, is Charlevoix himself out of date; so also is his editor and translator, and no hint is given of the new sources of information.

So much we may say by way of criticism; yet we are glad to have this handsome edition of Charlevoix with its clear type and broad margins. Dr. Shea printed his works in editions often absurdly small, and they are, therefore, scarce. This first volume contains Charlevoix's chronological tables of the history of New France down to 1743, the time of writing; his list of authors consulted (for the time remarkably full); and the first three books of his *History*. These cover the early efforts of France in the St. Lawrence valley, the history of the French colonies in Brazil and Florida which ended in such complete disaster, and the story of the first

settlement in Acadia or Nova Scotia, until its destruction by the English from Virginia. Since Dr. Shea wrote much new material has been discovered relating to the Huguenot settlement in Florida. Fewer, but still some, new documents have also been found shedding light upon early French effort in Nova Scotia and on the St. Lawrence. In so sumptuous an edition some attempt, we must repeat, ought to have been made to bring the notes up to the level of present-day scholarship.

The German and Swiss Settlements of Colonial Pennsylvania. A Study of the so-called Pennsylvania Dutch. By OSCAR KUHN. (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1901. Pp. 268.)

The Germans in Colonial Times. By LUCY FORNEY BITTINGER. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1901. Pp. 314.)

It is unfortunate that the history of the Pennsylvania Germans has reached the English-speaking public, for the most part, in the form of *sketches* written by laymen or laywomen who either did not know the subject, or did not understand the art of bookmaking. Attention was directed to this in the review of Cobb's *Story of the Palatines* (AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, III. 553) but since that time even more flagrant illustrations of superficial treatment of the subject have been furnished in Beidelman's *The Story of the Pennsylvania Germans*, Easton, 1898, and in Lucy Forney Bittinger's *The Germans in Colonial Times*. It can not be said, of course, of all, or even most of the writers who have contributed to the *Annual Reports* of the Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland or to the *Proceedings* of the Pennsylvania German Society, that they are trained historians, but this must be said to their credit: first, that they restrict themselves to brief periods or to definite and more or less local problems; second, that they actually collect new material and treat the matter on their own account; third, they subject their results to editorial committees for revision. In this way useful results have been obtained for both of these publications. A good instance of this kind of commendable amateur work is Hermann Schuhricht's *History of the German Element in Virginia* (eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth *Annual Reports* of the Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland, 1897-1900).

The work of Miss Bittinger is a narrative of the chief episodes of the history of the Germans in this country in the colonial epoch. The story is loosely thrown together, following in the main the general plan of the older German books, which took their cue from Franz Löher's *Geschichte und Zustände der Deutschen in Amerika* (Cincinnati and Leipzig, 1847). The work is a hasty compilation, made after a brief study into the literature of the subject, but is in no sense a scientific contribution to the history of the Germans in America. The sources consulted are mentioned at the end of the book, but without any apparent reference to their order of importance or publication. This bibliography is limited almost ex-

clusively to American works, and even here we note the omission of such general accounts as Eickhoff's *In der neuen Heimat*. The pseudo-novel application of the term "Völkerwanderung" in the *Foreword* is too naïve to require comment. Moreover, it is no longer in place to speak of the Germans in America as an undiscovered or newly discovered people.

The style of the book is rugged and at times obscure, as the following passage will show (p. 15): "Men with none of that preparation of heart which our forefathers *quaintly* called 'experimental religion' were ordained and ministered to congregations, famished for plain teaching of duty, scholastic treatises, or furious polemics against the sins of sectarianism, the dangers of good works, and the wickedness of prayer-meetings." After this passage, such offences against style as "nor did it *content* the longings of many" (p. 13); "Of which Penn, *like* the able man that he was, took advantage," appear slight. It is regrettable that the most hasty and superficial treatments of the history of these Germans, such as S. G. Fisher's *The Making of Pennsylvania* and that of Miss Bittinger, should have come without critical revision from Pennsylvania itself and from Philadelphia, where the great original sources are so rich and numerous.

As offsetting the works above mentioned we have a really good account of the Pennsylvania Germans in Kuhn's *The German and Swiss Settlements of Colonial Pennsylvania*. This is the first scholarly treatment of the general subject yet published in the English language. The author, himself to the manner born, has actually taken the trouble, not only to look up and "consult" the literature on the subject, but has, unlike his predecessors, *assimilated* the material of his sources and given it independent treatment. The general outline of the book overlaps at some points that of Miss Bittinger's. The chapters treat successively: The Historic Background, Settlement of the German Counties of Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania-German Farmer in the Eighteenth Century, Language and Literature, The Religious Life, In Peace and in War, and as an appendix, Pennsylvania-German Family Names.

Attempts have been made by others to trace the causes which led to the early migration of the Germans to Pennsylvania, attempts based largely upon the older books of Häusser, *Geschichte der Rheinischen Pfalz*, and Löher, *Geschichte und Zustände*; whereas Kuhns, like everyone fully acquainted with the subject, knows of the existence of such important books as Freytag's *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, Riehl's charming books, especially *Die Pfälzer*, and *Culturstudien*. He institutes upon the basis of these and other still more recent authorities such as Dändliker, *Geschichte der Schweiz* (1893-1895), Höfler, *Volksmedizin und Aberglaube in Oberbayerns Gegenwart und Vergangenheit* (new ed. 1893), and E. H. Meyer, *Deutsche Volkskunde* (1898), a comparison of the Pennsylvania Germans with their European successors. These sources have been cited in such a way as to enable the reader to follow out the subject on his own account. And we cannot commend too highly to our American publishers as well as bookmakers, the German footnote

method here employed of keeping tab on the subject-matter, even of popular books. It is high time that English and American writers of treatises should cease to pose as infallible oracles by ignoring the sources from which they draw. Besides being an exasperation to the intelligent reader, such oracular books are a waste of time to the busy investigator.

While Professor Kuhns does not claim originality in the way of investigation for his book, he has, nevertheless, in addition to the feature of good method noted above, made a new contribution to the subject in the chapter on the Pennsylvania-German family names, a subject to which he has given special attention for a number of years.

Among the features specially worthy of note are: The clear presentation of the origin and relation of the various German sects in Pennsylvania, for the general reader the best statement of the subject in English; the description of the German farmer; the felicitous comparisons of the Rhenish Palatinate (Rheinpfalz) and Switzerland with German Pennsylvania; references to parallels in German literature, particularly in the case of the Pennsylvania-German proverbs and the clear presentation of the attitude of the Pennsylvania Germans toward education.

If the book were not such a good one, we should be inclined to find fault with a few points, such as the following: The exaggeration of the importance of the Mennonites as compared with their Quaker neighbors (pp. 175 f.) and the exclusive use of the term "Reformed Mennonites" instead of the happier and more local term "New Mennonites" ("New-Mennists"); and the statement that the mysticism of Kelpius was an excessive form of pietism (p. 159). Of course this mysticism has its roots farther back in Jacob Böhme and in the earlier mystics of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. It was rather a parallel development with pietism from the earlier impulse. Pietism finds its prototype rather in Luther and Tauler, while mysticism in the same period is represented by the disciples of Böhme, Kuhlmann, Knorr von Rosenroth and their kind (cf. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenlieds*, IV. 175 ff). The statement on p. 81 that Germans as servants did not come till late in the eighteenth century seems open to question. The line between "redemptioner" and "servant" seems not to have been so strictly drawn, even in the seventeenth century; as appears from Benjamin Furly's "Collection of Various Pieces Concerning Pennsylvania" (*Penn. Mag.* Cf. also "Indentured Labor in Pennsylvania," thesis in MS. by C. A. Herrick; and F. R. Diffenderffer's treatment of the Redemptioners in *Proceedings of the Penna. German Society*, last volume).

In the discussion of flowers and horticulture we note no reference to the works of John David Schoepf, *Materia Medica Americana*, etc., Erlangen 1787, and *Reise durch einige der mittlern südl. Vereinigten nord-amer. Staaten, 1783-1784*, Erlangen 1788; or to Fr. Ad. Jul. von Wangenheim's *Beschreibung einiger nordamericanischen Holz- und Buscharten, mit Anwendung auf deutsche Forste*, Göttingen 1781, and *Beytrag zur deutschen holzgerechten Forstwissenschaft, die Anpflanzung nordamericanischer Holzarten*, etc., Göttingen 1787, folio, with excel-

lent cuts illustrating American trees). In the chapter *In Peace and in War* we should have expected some mention of such well-known works as J. G. Rosengarten's *The German Soldier in the Wars of the United States*, and Lowell's *The Hessians and the other German Auxiliaries of Great Britain in the Revolution*, not to speak of other important sources both English and German.

It is not quite orthodox philology to say as on page 120, that Pennsylvania-German *pf* is "simplified" to *p*; the accepted point of view is that the *p* was not mutated or shifted to the fricata *pf* in this case. In fairness to the Schwenkfelders the author might have mentioned the fact that they took definite steps toward higher education as early as 1764, and that this impulse still continues in vigorous form in the Perkio-men Seminary of Pennsburg, Pa. The statement that the Dunkards date their origin from 1719 is misleading or rather incorrect, as the beginning of the sect goes back to the Schwarzenau Brethren of 1708 (cf. Brunbaugh, *A History of the Brethren*, p. 29 ff.). The following misprints have been noted in the list of sources cited: *Eckhoff*, p. 248 for *Eickhoff*; *Gibson* for *Gibbons*.

Passing by all these minor details, we close by emphasizing the great service which such a systematic general survey as that of Professor Kuhns must render both to the general public and to historical science, by presenting in orderly form accurate statements of facts and thus clearing the way for an intelligent appreciation of further results of more detailed historical research in this field. The felicitous style of the book makes it attractive to the general reader.

M. D. LEARNED.

Conrad Weiser, and the Indian Policy of Colonial Pennsylvania. By JOSEPH S. WALTON. (Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs and Co. 1901. Pp. 420.)

THE impression which one gathers from popular treatises on American history with regard to the Indian policy of Pennsylvania is that William Penn, by one simple and praiseworthy transaction at Shackamaxon, purchased the soil of Pennsylvania from its Indian proprietors; that his successors with weaker conscience took advantage of their ignorance and defrauded them, and that this brought on the Indian troubles of 1755 and succeeding years. A very little study will suffice to shatter the simplicity of this interesting story. The whole history of colonial Pennsylvania is a history of constant Indian negotiations. Penn bought up the south-eastern corner by piece-meal. His successors continued the transaction and the last section was not purchased till 1782.

Various factors complicated the problem for both white and red men. In the first half-century of provincial life there was but one party in the colonial government so far as the Indian question was concerned. Later, when the proprietors pulled one way and the popularly elected assembly another, each tried to gain certain advantages by thwarting the plans of

the other. Then there was the rivalry of the colonies to the North and South for the Indian trade and the constant fear up to 1760 of the designs of the French. Equally intricate were Indian politics. William Penn purchased the land from the Lenape Indians on the Delaware. After his death, the Iroquois claimed a lordship over these Delaware Indians and demanded a repurchase of the soil from them. They in turn were divided among themselves—some being warm friends of the New York English and others inclining toward the French. They scorned the Pennsylvania Indians and rudely asserted their exclusive claims to the soil. These claims the Delawares and Shawnees admitted till, driven into opposition by the injustice of the Pennsylvania proprietors and the tyranny of the Iroquois, they threw themselves into the arms of the French. To preserve a balance among all these conflicting interests of red and white men required diplomacy of a skilful order. It is to unravel this diplomacy during its most complicated times from 1731 to 1758 that the book before us is written.

Much of the interest of the narrative settles around the name of Conrad Weiser. This man of German stock spent fifteen years of his boyhood and early manhood among the Six Nations. He learned their languages and adopted their customs and prejudices. The Delaware Indians charged him with being an adopted Mohawk, and this nation gave him the high praise that "He wore out his shoes in our messages and dirtied his clothes by being amongst us, so that he is as nasty as an Indian."

This close identity gave him great influence and probably determined the neutrality of the Iroquois on several occasions when the French had them almost persuaded to lift the bloody tomahawk. The Mohawks were steady to an English alliance. The Senecas were equally inclined for a time toward the French. But Weiser kept the strong central tribe of Onondagoes faithful to neutrality, and this turned the scale. His foresight and tact were continually in use in extending the Pennsylvania trade in the Ohio valley and in thwarting the designs of the French. As provincial interpreter for about a quarter of a century, he was a central figure in every Indian conference. He saw the need of justice and fairness, he vigorously protested against frontier rumsellers and fraudulent traders, and no dangers or difficulties from men or nature ever daunted him.

But where an important end was to be gained, he was at least willing that doubtful means should be used. In an important conference at Lancaster the journalist says, "We were obliged to put about the glasses pretty briskly," while Weiser explained the terms of the treaty. Under the combined influence of spirits and logic the Indian signatures were secured. He seems to have been one of a number who agreed to keep Teedyuscung drunk a day each at Easton in 1758 till he was brought to the proper decision.

These lapses he probably justified by the justice and importance of the end secured. In other directions his results were not so happy. The Delaware and Shawnee Indians were driven by the Walking Purchase of

1737, the insults heaped upon them by the proprietors and the Six Nations in 1742, and the Albany treaty of 1754, into distrust, alienation, and finally the bloody events of 1755 and succeeding years. Toward this end Weiser contributed. He defended the Walking Purchase; he opposed the Moravians and the Quakers in their peaceful efforts; he tried to induce the German voters to turn against their Quaker allies and even appears to have petitioned the English government to declare the Quakers ineligible to the Assembly. He agreed with them as to the necessity of giving large Indian presents and was always trustworthy and judicious in their distribution, but *they* gave for peace and neutrality while *he* wished to give for warlike operations against the French. It was his advice to the Proprietors in 1732 that induced them to recognize the Iroquois claims to the Delaware valley, and so brought on the troubles with the resident Indians. In all the later partisan struggles between governor and assembly, he sided with the war policy of the younger Penns and their deputies in the province. While, therefore, his courage, devotion and honesty were ever at the call of the province, and his unique qualities and experience made his services of the highest value, the limitations of his diplomacy were shown by his failure to retain the friendship of the Pennsylvania Indians as he did the Six Nations.

The story is told most exhaustively by Mr. Walton. The main defect would seem to be a superabundance of detail for the ordinary reader interested in provincial affairs—a detail which sometimes obscures the main features of the history. His sources of information have been the manuscript letters of Conrad Weiser himself and of Richard Peters, and the *Archives* and *Colonial Records* of Pennsylvania. From these he has gathered a great mass of interesting information and has given an intelligible and reliable account. There are a few errors in small matters. Stenton is mentioned as the governor's mansion, and the name of James Logan is repeatedly mentioned for his son William after 1751, when James Logan died. These do not, however, seriously detract from the value of Mr. Walton's work, which will be a permanent contribution of value to our history.

The Men Who Made the Nation. An Outline of United States History from 1760 to 1865. By EDWIN ERLE SPARKS, Ph.D. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. viii, 410.)

THE special student of American history will find little to interest him in this book, which is designed for the "general" and "untrained" reader. Such a design is entirely legitimate. The work of familiarizing the general reader with the history of his own country and of inciting him to further study of that history is as useful and necessary as that of investigation for the benefit of a limited number of specialists.

Dr. Sparks begins with the hypothesis "that at any given period one man will be found who is master of the situation, and events naturally group themselves about him." Starting with Franklin and closing with

Lincoln he constructs an outline of American history by grouping around the names of men whom he chooses as typical of periods in our national development the principal events of such periods. This method of writing the connected history of a country presents two difficulties, neither of which has the author wholly escaped. One is the tendency to write a series of disconnected biographies, and the other, ignoring the hypothesis upon which this book is based, to use the names of the great personalities chosen simply as convenient pegs upon which to hang the events of the eras they represent. In some chapters the man is nearly lost sight of in the narrative of events. In the chapter on Lincoln the great events of the Civil War period receive scant attention in comparison with that bestowed on the character, early life and environment of the man.

There is a danger that a book of this character may lead the general reader into the error of supposing that a few individuals, rather than social, economic and political forces, occasionally directed but never created by single individuals, have made our country what it is. Dr. Sparks tries to guard against this danger by asserting, from time to time, the presence of forces more potent in nation-building than the men to whom he is assigning that great work. When treating of the acquisition of Louisiana in violation of the constitutional scruples of Jefferson he says (p. 239): "Necessity was continuing to make the nation," and again he speaks (p. 277) of "the law of compulsion" as deciding the great constitutional question of the right to undertake internal improvements at federal expense.

With few exceptions excellent judgment has been shown in assigning to events and movements their proper relative position. Controversial questions have been fairly treated, although the author prefers to leave the question as to Webster's honesty of purpose in the Seventh of March speech unanswered. John C. Calhoun might well have been made the subject of a chapter in which the whole question of slavery in American politics could have received adequate treatment, which is lacking in the volume as it now stands. The method of treating men as exponents of particular phases of our national life occasionally leads the author to suppress or ignore important facts. Henry Clay is considered as the father of public improvements. The chapter bearing his name does not mention the great compromises with which he is associated. No mention (pp. 274-275) is made of the United States Bank as an issue in the election of 1832. The reader is left to infer that the attitude of Clay upon the subject of internal improvements was the sufficient cause of his defeat. Accuracy in the statement of facts is the rule throughout the book. An exception may be mentioned (p. 288) where 1840 rather than 1831 is given as the date when the practice of nominations for the presidency by state legislatures began to give way to nominations in national conventions.

The book seems to have been based, and legitimately so, upon secondary sources, except that the narrative is enlivened by many anecdotes, incidents, and specimens of contemporary verse that are taken from original sources. The author has included a large number of well-chosen

reproductions of old and rare prints, of clippings from newspapers, and of title-pages from original editions of important political publications. The English style is admirably adapted to the popular character of the book. It is clear and direct, dignified yet interesting. The proof-reading has been excellent and the printing and binding are what one always expects from the Macmillan Company.

MARSHALL S. BROWN.

The Frigate Constitution, the Central Figure of the Navy under Sail.

By IRA N. HOLLIS. (Boston : Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1900. Pp. x, 264.)

The Monitor and the Navy under Steam. By FRANK M. BENNETT, Lieutenant U. S. Navy. (Boston : Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1900. Pp. x, 370.)

AMERICAN naval history has recently received a valuable addition in two books lately published. One, *The Frigate Constitution*, by Professor Ira N. Hollis, describes that memorable period of our country's history in which our navy, like all others, was composed of sailing ships, and when its many famous deeds were performed without steam power and by the sole favor of the wind and currents.

The other book by Lieutenant Bennett of our navy entitled *The Monitor and the Navy under Steam* covers the present period, in which the development of steam and armor engrosses public attention ; the *Monitor* marking the opening of that period, in the War of the Rebellion ; while the *Indiana* and her type in the fighting against Cervera furnish tangible proofs of the great strides we have made in the forty years intervening.

Professor Hollis's book, *The Frigate Constitution*, has for sub-title "The Central Figure of the Navy under Sail." The history of the navy during the sail period is in a large degree represented by the record of this great ship, whose various achievements form an almost continuous thread running through long periods of our national life.

The author has given us a most interesting book, and one which, while very useful for historical reference, is made especially interesting by the author's correct and pleasing literary style. His deductions and inferences display for the most part logical and exact processes of reasoning, although we cannot agree with his assertion on page 4 that "Before the invention of the telegraph and the steam engine, campaigns were relatively much longer." We have had no great naval wars and campaigns since the later inventions, and there is nothing in the nature of things to make us believe that campaigns or battles will be shorter or longer. This is an affair of men and of nations, and their physical and nervous endurance, rather than of materials and improved mechanics. Fleets, that in the past "dodged" each other by favor of the wind, will do so more easily with steam at their disposal ; we have had an example

of it in late years. The same is true of land campaigns: Germany, under certain conditions, overcame France in six months; England, on the other hand, is taking two years to finish her campaign against the Boers. History tells us that naval engagements last about four to five hours; Lissa and the Yalu were not different in this from Salamis and Lepanto. The same principle applies to campaigns, and the question will always be one of endurance. If only one side had the steam-engine wars might be shortened and campaigns and battles as well, but both have it, and armor and modern guns, in equal measure. The essential factor is now, as always, not the tool but the hand that uses it; not the weapon but the weapon-wielder.

The author is at his best in the chapters which deal with our war with Tripoli. His gift of description and clearness of style give great value and effectiveness to his brief but lucid narrative of the *Constitution* and our fleet on the Barbary coasts. The same praise is due to the chapters from seven to eleven, in which the author records in the same excellent fashion the prowess and high deeds of our noble frigate during the war of 1812.

Perhaps, however, we should assign the greatest credit to his last chapter where he sums up "what we owe to the *Constitution*;" for it is there that we perceive most clearly the philosophic turn of the author's mind. "It is seldom the event," he says, "which forms character, but rather the revelation of the possibilities within." "Slowly amid numerous humiliations and trials the common people of this country had been acquiring confidence in their union without knowing it." Some great event was needed to show them to themselves. This shock, opening their eyes to the truth, was supplied, our author tells us, by the victory of the *Constitution* over the *Guerrière*, and "brought to the surface the real feeling of the New England people." This and other similar evidences of clear thinking make Professor Hollis's book highly valuable as a contribution to history; and we venture the hope that he has much of such future historical work in prospect.

Lieutenant Bennett's book is full of clearly presented truths. That he should in the opening lines have upheld the fallacy that "The steam-engine has made the nineteenth century a period of marvellous advancement," is not important, because many people who read the book will agree with him. There are some persons of observation and intelligence, who believe that great events must be accounted for by some one special concrete cause. Their minds cling to the needle-gun as the factor which defeated the Austrians in 1866; it is more pleasing to some imaginations that the needle-gun should have done it rather than the laborious toil of thousands of Prussian officers through half a century, building up gradually great qualities of discipline and efficiency. The steam-engine did not greatly affect the nineteenth century, and is only one of numerous fruits of the growth of the race during that century indicating the quality and temper of this stage of national development. The steam-engine is a product of civilization, but not itself a producer; it is an effect not a cause.

A similar doubt hangs about the author's next statement that we have more progress to place to the credit of our nineteenth century, than did those less lucky people, who looked back through their eighteenth or seventeenth century at its achievements. This error too is very popular, and we may be sure that people of General Washington's and Napoleon's time thought the same of the eighteenth, as we do of the nineteenth century, although it may be questioned whether Washington and Napoleon themselves, with their philosophical minds, shared these views.

But why should we dwell upon errors, or perhaps only differences of opinion of author and critic, when we have before us so excellent a work, of lucid style and arrangement, and everywhere governed by the clear judgment and quick mental perception which only can make a mass of facts digestible for readers, or in any way useful to history.

The story begins with an introduction on the "Origin and Progress of Steam Navigation," a well-proportioned résumé of the whole subject. In his next chapter, "Building and Battle of the Iron-Clads," the author has shown by a simple narrative of facts, the conditions which governed the creation of an armored fleet, bringing the chapter to an end with the natural climax of the engagement of the *Merrimac* and *Monitor*. This picture is made plainly visible to us by the author's excellent clearness of style, and his discretion as to the use of excessive language, enabling the reader to contemplate this remarkable event without the disturbance of mind which an inflated rhetoric frequently induces, when describing the heroic acts of history, however simple and simply performed they may have been.

Under the heading of "Some Naval Events of the Civil War" Lieutenant Bennett, in his next chapter, discusses the principal battles of that period, with a natural concentration of interest upon the operations of Admiral Farragut's fleet. In describing this hero of the sea, the author's simplicity of narrative continues unabated, and much as we admire the absence of hysterical laudation in his book, there seems something a little cold in those pages which record the noble achievements of our fleets under Farragut; but Lieutenant Bennett remembers always—and very properly it must be conceded—that he is not writing eulogies, but a history of steam development in our navy. Even in this connection, however, a very strong point could be made of Farragut's influence upon the development of a steam navy. He possessed so high an intelligence, and so keen a discernment, that it was impossible for him to be hide-bound by traditions of former days, if a real improvement in war-fleets presented itself. He never questioned the value of steam as a great factor of war, nor was any improved form of vessel or torpedo-boat or ram discredited with him because it was new or different from his traditions. It was not so with all our leaders. Some there were, of acknowledged bravery and ability, who could not rise above professional prejudices, born of a lifetime of faithful service indeed—but none the less warping their minds and limiting their power to serve their country in time of need.

H. C. TAYLOR.

Ulysses S. Grant. By OWEN WISTER. [Beacon Biographies.]
(Boston : Small, Maynard and Co. 1900. Pp. xvii, 145.)

SOME most striking paragraphs about Grant are to be found in this pocket volume. Witness the first page :

"At the age of thirty-nine, Grant was an obscure failure in a provincial town. To him and his family, for whom he could not earn needful bread, his father had become a last shelter against the struggle for life. Not all the neighbors knew his face. At the age of forty-three his picture hung in the homes of grateful millions. His name was joined with Washington's. A little while, and we see him step down, amid discordant reproach, from Washington's chair, having helplessly presided over scandal and villany blacker than the country had thus far witnessed. Next, his private integrity is darkly overcast, and the stroke kills him. But death clears his sky. At the age of sixty-three Grant died ; and the people paused to mourn and honor him devotedly. All the neighbors know his face to-day." And thus, of the time following his resignation from the old army : "There came a time when he walked the streets, seeking employment. So painful was it all that those who knew him preferred to cross the street rather than meet him."

Many who watched closely at Washington throughout Grant's presidential term, and watched as unfriendly critics, will still contend that the sentence into which those eight years are condensed is quite too harsh, but it serves to call vividly to mind conditions which were a blot upon the times.

From first to last the book is incisive, and fixes attention. It deals in high praise, as well as most unsparing criticism. Throughout, it is strong in its contrasts—Grant as he was, and what, step by step, he became. The author aims at accuracy in his details, but instead of consulting the open official records has repeated many venerable myths which have been handed down through a long line of notable writers, but which for the most part had their origin in the uncertainties of information flashed through the smoke of battle. Thus, after Donelson Grant was not "put in arrest" by Halleck. Stanton authorized it, but Halleck did not do it. When Grant arrived at Chattanooga "order was nowhere." He arrived : "And forthwith order began to shape itself from formlessness." These statements are not only incorrect but libels upon a thoroughly organized and valiant army, and one that "starvation" did not turn from its purpose by so much as a hairsbreadth. Several pages are given to Gen. W. F. Smith's "scheme for the new avenue of supplies" with which Grant "was delighted." An army board of distinguished officers—Major-General Brooke president—has just decided, after exhaustive consideration of the entire record, that Rosecrans devised the plan, and Gen. Thomas ordered it executed without consulting Gen. Smith. Longstreet is represented as fighting Hooker "on Lookout Mountain" instead of in Lookout Valley when Hooker first arrived at Wauhatchie. Again, "By night Hooker was established there" (the top of the moun-

tain). No Union troops reached the top of Lookout during Hooker's battle. "As Sherman came fighting along Missionary Ridge from the left Bragg removed more troops from the centre" to oppose him. Sherman carried no part of Missionary Ridge proper, did not advance along it, and Bragg sent no troops whatever from the centre toward Sherman. On the contrary, three brigades, namely, Brown's, Cummins's and Maney's, were ordered from in front of Sherman to resist Thomas's assault in the centre.

The dozen pages towards the close of the little volume present the most graphic picture of the closing days of Lee's army yet given by any writer in such compass. The full Grant chronology is a most attractive and valuable addition to the volume. All in all it is a striking book; but the editor should have applied the test of the official records to its statements of detail.

Historic Towns of the Southern States. Edited by LYMAN P. POWELL, with introduction by W. P. TRENT. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1900. Pp. xxxviii, 604.)

THE book before us completes the triad of volumes on the older American Historic Towns, the former numbers of the series having dealt with the historic towns of the New England and of the Middle States respectively. In the interest of clearness of thought there ought to be a more general agreement as to what states constitute "the South;" for the expression is fast becoming as vague a one as that of "the West," and quite as ambulatory. Does the word Southern convey a geographical, a social, or a political idea? From any point of view it is surprising to find that no mention is made in this volume of San Antonio, the connecting link between Latin and Anglo-Saxon America, and a city literally teeming with historic monuments. It is scarcely less unfortunate that separate chapters have not been devoted to Alexandria and Georgetown. Just why such ancient boroughs are ignored, as dead as Jamestown though they may be, and considerable space devoted both to Frederic Town—famous only by reason of Whittier's imaginary incident—and Little Rock, where not even romance appears ever to have recorded anything peculiarly striking, are among the several diverting features of the volume. Curiously enough, moreover, of the eighteen towns described herein with varying degrees of interest, fully one-fourth are southern or northern according to one's point of view.

Professor Trent's introductory essay is by all odds the most modern and valuable portion of the book. In it he sets forth at considerable length and with great clearness the manifold economic and social conditions which hindered the growth of urban communities at the South prior to the Civil War. He also throws considerable light on the various attempts of *ante bellum* leaders to foster the growth of commerce and industries—a favorite expedient having been the convention. The greatest drawback to most of the other papers is their lack of originality. Their

authors, as a rule, appear to be much more interested in the remote history of the states in which the towns they write about are situated than in the history of the towns themselves, and it is this lack of local coloring, so to speak, that causes the present volume to suffer by a comparison with its predecessors. Not that the South is lacking in towns of historic interest, for in no other part of the United States would a proper study of urban beginnings yield more fruitful results. The trouble seems to lie mainly in the absence of a trained corps of investigators. Comparatively little, for example, is said by any of these writers about city charters, municipal activity, statistics of wealth and population, or, indeed, anything else that is likely to prove either of interest or value to the student of local institutions.

Perhaps the best chapters are those represented by Mr. Yates Snowden's "Charleston," the late Mr. William Wirt Henry's "Richmond," President Lyon G. Tyler's "Williamsburg," Mr. Peter J. Hamilton's "Mobile," Professor George Petrie's "Montgomery," Judge Joshua W. Caldwell's "Knoxville," and Mr. Lucien V. Rule's "Louisville." It is noteworthy that in the article on New Orleans nothing whatever is said about such topics as Lafitte, the Civil War, or reconstruction. The book is generously illustrated. It contains a good index, and is comparatively free from typographical errors. And in spite of the imperfections indicated above, those who may perchance read the volume will not only get a better knowledge of the romance of the Old South and the promise of the New, but they will also find scattered throughout its pages many important references to original sources.

B. J. RAMAGE.

Chapters from Illinois History. By EDWARD G. MASON. (Chicago: Herbert S. Stone and Co. 1901. Pp. 322.)

THE ambition of the late Edward G. Mason, for some time president of the Chicago Historical Society, to write a scholarly and exhaustive history of the state of Illinois found realization only in five "chapters" now brought out by a Chicago firm as a posthumous work. Probably only the first of these five fragments, that entitled "The Land of the Illinois," is in its final and accepted form; yet no doubt a large part of the remaining detached essays would have found a place in the completed work. They bear the titles: "Illinois in the Eighteenth Century," "Illinois in the Revolution," "The March of the Spaniards across Illinois" and "The Chicago Massacre" (of 1812). The first was printed by the Fergus Company of Chicago, in 1881, and the third in the *Magazine of American History* for May, 1886. The others have never appeared in print.

The "Land of the Illinois" begins with what the author regards as the earliest written reference to the Illinois Indians, "a nation where there is a quantity of buffalo," as marked on the map of New France made by Champlain in 1632. From this starting-point, the narrative

proceeds with painstaking exactness and minute research until La Salle and Tonty appear, when the labor of investigation becomes a labor of delight in recounting their heroic deeds. In the full swing of appreciative and vigorous narrative, the hand of the penman is suddenly relaxed. Death stopped the story in the promise of its excellence as it cut off the writer in the very height of his usefulness. The narrative ends abruptly with the reappointment of Frontenac to the governorship of Canada in 1689. La Salle had met his tragic fate; but his faithful follower, Tonty, "first seigneur of the Isle of Tonty," was still governor of Fort St. Louis on the Illinois river.

The reader of this story of the beginnings of French dominion in Illinois is immediately struck by the almost unparalleled list of citations, necessarily led by the Jesuit Relations. Scarcely a statement is made for which two or more authorities are not given. Where these materially differ, the author has stated his preference with the clearness of the lawyer. Indeed, the legal training of Mr. Mason is most evident in the judicial severity with which he examines the numerous and often conflicting statements in manuscripts and maps of the Jesuits and traders in those evolutionary days. His style is usually as simple as a chronicle, leaving the reader to absorb the facts.

The multiplicity of names introduced makes the need of an index almost imperative. Its absence renders the book almost as useless to the student as a library would be without a catalogue. No doubt the unfinished condition of the work explains this lack; but it can scarcely ensure pardon to the publishers for the omission.

The credit for the discovery of the upper Mississippi and the Illinois valleys Mr. Mason would give to Jolliet (always so written here) rather than to Marquette. "Every reliable authority demonstrates the mistake, and yet the delusion continues." His argument rests upon the statement of Marquette that Jolliet was sent to discover new countries and he to preach the gospel; that Frontenac reported Jolliet as the man selected for this purpose; that Father Dablon confirms this statement; and that the Canadians rewarded only Jolliet for the discovery.

Father Hennepin appears as "a vain, good-natured and sadly unreliable friar." The Jesuits generally take a position of secondary importance and many appear in a way likely to be challenged by their adherents. On many points disputed by local historians, Mr. Mason speaks authoritatively. He locates Fort Crèvecoeur in Woodford county, Illinois, some distance above Peoria; traces its name not to La Salle's disappointment, as does Parkman, but to a fort of that name in the Netherlands in the capture of which Tonty had participated, or to the French noble family of that name; puts Fort St. Louis on the top of what is now "Starved Rock;" and follows Joutel in deriving the word "Chicago" from wild garlic. Quite naturally, the "first" things of Chicago occupy no little space, as when La Salle's letter headed "Du portage de Checagou 4 jan. 1683" is pointed out as the first document written entirely at what is now the western metropolis.

The chapter on "Illinois in the Eighteenth Century" is made up of a sketch of old Fort Chartres under French rule, in which an excellent description of the present appearance of the fort is given, and extracts from the minute book of Col. John Todd, who became governor of the Virginia county of Illinois in 1778. It shows the introduction of American government. "Illinois in the Revolution" covers not only the expedition of George Rogers Clark but the lesser-known forays of Tom Brady, Paulette Meillet, James Willing, and Le Balme against the English and the retaliatory excursions of Indians and British under de Verville and under de Longlade.

The "Spanish March across Illinois" describes an expedition sent from Spanish St. Louis in 1781 against the British trading post at St. Joseph, where Niles, Michigan, now stands. Rejecting the usually accepted thought that it was simply a marauding expedition of Spanish, French and Indians against a common foe, Mr. Mason argues very forcefully that it was deliberately planned to substantiate the claim of Spain to the land lying between the mountains and the Mississippi, to be fully set forth at the end of the Revolutionary War. Among the author's strongest arguments is a warning letter from John Jay to Congress, enclosing an account of the expedition which had appeared in the *Madrid Gazette*.

Mr. Mason was Connecticut born, a graduate of Yale, a man of wealth, and a busy lawyer, who yet found time and energy to build up a flourishing historical society, housed in an absolutely fireproof building, and to give to the public these sketches which not only make a clear and convincing presentation of known matter but also add not a little to the usable information concerning early Illinois.

EDWIN ERLE SPARKS.

American Relations in the Pacific and the Far East, 1784-1900. By JAMES MORTON CALLAHAN, Ph.D. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1901. Pp. 177.)

THIS book is the outgrowth of a course of lectures delivered before graduate students in Johns Hopkins University in 1899-1900, on the origin and evolution of American enterprise and policy in the Pacific and Far East. It contains ten chapters with a subject index and an appendix.

The text covers about 150 pages, with nearly 300 footnotes; a very small space for so large a subject. By avoiding unnecessary repetition more space could have been obtained for interesting details.

Dr. Callahan deserves our special thanks for giving abstracts of several unpublished documents, including Lieutenant Ingraham's Journal of the Voyage of the *Hope*, from Boston to the northwest coast of America (p. 18), which deserves to be published in full. Unfortunately, however, he accepts too readily the statements of whatever voyager he is using at the time of writing, without taking pains to verify the statements from easily accessible sources. The account which he gives (on p. 17) of the

Metcalf Massacre differs in certain important particulars from all other contemporary accounts, but the author gives no reason for discrediting them, nor does he even refer to them. In fact there is much curious information in the book, difficult to obtain elsewhere, but loosely put together and not well digested.

From its very comprehensive title one might expect a larger view of the subject, less detail on unimportant points and a more thorough treatment of critical events. Instead there is a tendency to steer clear of debatable questions, and traverse new seas, where the course is not so well known and the sailing is smoother. Otherwise it is difficult to understand why a whole chapter is given to "the Port Lloyd Colony in the Bonin Islands," except that little notice has ever been taken of it; while in the chapter devoted to "early American interests on the Pacific coast" there is no mention whatever of the voyage of the *Columbia* on which the Columbia river was discovered. The incident is given the briefest possible mention in a foot-note (p. 20), in an earlier chapter, but with no references.

The best part of the work is that which relates to "unlocking the gates of the Orient." It is a pity that Dr. Callahan did not give more than forty pages to this subject, which has so much interest at present.

The Americanization of Hawaii, a subject on which volumes might be (and have been) written, is disposed of in twenty pages. There is probably no one topic in American relations in the Pacific which has received more attention than the question of the reason for the landing of troops from the *Boston* in Honolulu on January 16, 1893; but Dr. Callahan is content to dismiss it with the bare statement that "by request of the unopposed *de facto* government, marines from the *Boston* were landed to preserve order" (p. 130). This he bases on the statement of a single naval officer who has written a popular book on the subject. The whole chapter is too brief to be of much service without more extensive references. In its thirty-one foot-notes there is not a single reference to any of the standard histories of Hawaii, except a general mention of Jarvis.

The chapter on Samoa does more justice to its subject, and is well worth reading. The Philippines are summarily disposed of in half a dozen pages, and the book closes with a brief sketch of the "international situation in the Far East."

The title of the book makes it exceedingly difficult to form a just estimate of Dr. Callahan's work. Taking the title as it stands the book is a disappointment; much that is of importance has been left out, and too many trivial details have been introduced. On the other hand if the volume had been entitled "Brief Notes for a History of America in the Pacific and the Far East," all omissions might easily have been pardoned, and the "trivial details" would be gladly welcomed as important additions to the literature of the subject. On the whole the book is worth having. There are too many typographical errors and there is a lack of uniformity in the spelling of proper names.

HIRAM BINGHAM, JR.

Verbeck of Japan, A Citizen of no Country; A Life Story of Foundation Work inaugurated by Guido Fridolin Verbeck. By WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS. (New York, Chicago and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1900. Pp. 376.)

To the student this book is a vexation, to the casual reader a delight. It is not placed on the solid adequate basis that this eminent missionary's personality and career deserved, yet Mr. Griffis writes with so much vividness and sympathy that during the pleasure of perusal his grave defects of conception and treatment do not offend. It is only afterwards, when we try to reproduce the picture, that we realize the shortcomings of the biography.

Here was a man of unusual course in life and of striking individuality. Born in Holland, spending his boyhood there, passing his early manhood in America practising his profession of engineering and striving for wealth, then turning his energies to theology, neglecting material pursuits, and consecrating himself to the spiritual calling of saving souls in a "heathen" land, G. F. Verbeck finally sets foot on Japanese soil at the crisis of a most pregnant and picturesque era in her history. With his great linguistic attainments (commanding six tongues), his wide appreciativeness, his tireless industry, his wonderful tact, and his high character, his services are invaluable and for years he enjoys the full confidence of the ruling and official class of the country.

He is made head of the leading college, plants the seed of the educational system of to-day, advises the organization of an army and other means of defense, is consulted on diplomatic affairs and inspires the despatch of the Iwakura embassy abroad. In reality at this portentous epoch, at the transition from medievalism to progressive modernism, he is the expert adviser to the supreme authority, and is chief among foreigners in laying the foundations of the present polity and constitutional government of the realm. Through these manifold duties he was all the abler to aid and estimate the effort to christianize which he ever held before him as the guiding star.

This favorable environment seems to have met a temperament equal to this glorious opportunity to understand the spirit of the age. The majority of missionaries everywhere have only the single eye of ecclesiasticism, and, like much of the voluminous correspondence of the Catholic priests in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, their records are dry and meagre except within contracted churchly channels. In talents and accomplishments at least, Verbeck was an exception to this narrowness of vision.

With this rare but happy union of the hour and the hero, the man fit for the occasion, it is justifiable to expect from his pen important revelations and valuable comments, an insight into the secret motives and mainsprings of that marvelous national transformation, a substantial addition to the history, both Christian and native, of the period.

But we are disappointed, though we have to a large extent the fulfillment of the promise made in the preface to let Verbeck speak for him-

self. It may be there was nothing more, as Verbeck may have been too busy to commit his impressions to paper. It may be that editorial prudence has suppressed matter till a more propitious time. But the selections we have and the hints of what we might have had, such as notes on epidemics (p. 97), a bit of Japanese table-talk (p. 105), and views on Japanese art (p. 177), lectures on "personal reminiscences," whet our appetite for more. Then his criticism in later years of certain race characteristics and certain phases of missionary methods would have undoubtedly aroused attention and might have been helpful. Of course it will not be seriously maintained that lack of space prevented any of Verbeck's product from incorporation, when we see the unwarranted obtrusion of the author over page after page, one chapter indeed being compactly headed "The Biographer in Tokio."

Thus the volume is made up, something of Verbeck as a man, something of him as a missionary, something of him as a statesman, interlarded with a considerable something of Griffis; a mixture of capital merits and unfortunate defects which were possibly unavoidable in part. The whole performance may be summarized as without structural purpose, unless that of mere entertainment can be called such. With this as the aim, however, it is excellently done, as Mr. Griffis blocked out his task so as to allow of a series of highly interesting essays which he has lumped together, without making apparent any systematic design to show a complete Verbeck.

C. MERIWETHER.

Canada under British Rule, 1760-1900. By Sir JOHN G. BOURINOT. [Cambridge Historical Series.] (Cambridge: University Press. 1900. Pp. xii, 346.)

SIR JOHN BOURINOT's book maintains the general level of excellence of the other volumes in the series to which it belongs, and furnishes a useful, though necessarily brief, account of Canada during the last hundred and forty years. An introductory chapter summarizes the chief events in the period of French exploration and occupation, and the political, economic and social conditions in Canada under the French régime. Then follows a review of the early years of British rule, the foundation of Nova Scotia, and the Canadian aspects of the American Revolution, an especially interesting account being given under the last head of the United Empire Loyalists, to whose subsequent political influence, particularly in New Brunswick, frequent reference is later made. The remainder of the story is grouped under the successive periods of the development of representative institutions (1784-1812), the war of 1812-1815, the evolution of responsible government (1815-1839), "a new era" of colonial government (1839-1867), marked by the union of the Canadas and the establishment of responsible government, a summary review of the evolution of confederation, and the history of Canada since 1867, when federation was achieved. A final chapter reviews the relations of Canada with the United States and the influence of the Dominion in imperial councils.

It will thus be seen that Sir John Bourinot's book is primarily a study of political development, and mainly of the working out of a form of government. Social and economic conditions, while incidentally referred to, are nowhere much dwelt upon. Sir John is too well informed on both Canadian and American history to fall into many errors in a book of this sort, and his feeling for the relative importance of things is generally sure. We do not think, however, that his treatment of the most important incident in early Canadian history—the Quebec act—is quite satisfactory. The four or five pages devoted to the subject hardly more than hint at the difficulties which the formulation of the act encountered, or the criticisms subsequently passed upon it. Sir John's chief purpose seems to be to prove that the act was not one of which the French Canadians could complain, but bespoke in a remarkable degree the justice and generosity of Great Britain; whereas it is clear that the act riveted upon Canada the problems of race and religion which have vexed the whole course of its subsequent history, and which apparently could have been more easily dealt with in 1774 than at any later time.

Sir John's discussion of the relations between Canada and the United States is, of course, rather pronouncedly British. The praise of the Canadian constitution and Canadian political methods, and, by way of contrast, not infrequent pointing out of ways in which the United States might improve the conduct of its political business are, of course, appropriate, though we do not think that Sir John can have had recent political occurrences in the Dominion particularly in mind, when he emphasizes as he does the relative success of the Canadians in freeing themselves from objectionable political influences. There runs throughout the book, indeed, a clearly perceptible vein of political pleading, of desire to score off an opponent, or show up a questionable political opposition, or defend Canada against its critics, or prove once more its loyalty to the empire. It is all interestingly done, but of course it is not exactly unbiassed history.

Appendices give comparisons, in parallel columns, of the main provisions of the constitutions of Canada and Australia, and a select list of authorities. The maps are credited to the Department of the Interior, at Ottawa.

WILLIAM MACDONALD.

A second edition of the *Manuel de Bibliographie Historique* of M. Charles V. Langlois has just been issued (Paris, Hachette). In the five years that have intervened since the first appearance of this indispensable work our supply of bibliographical aids has been largely increased, and in some fields works of the first importance have been published. One thinks at once of manuals like Gross's *Sources and Literature* and Channing and Hart's *Guide*, of journals such as the *Revue d'Histoire Moderne* and the *Archives Belges*, of the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica* of the Bollandists, the new Italian catalogue, and the French and German indexes to periodicals.

These and a number of lesser works and articles are carefully noted in the new edition, which shows the qualities of completeness, accuracy, and logical classification which we have come to expect from the author. Not only has the information been brought up to date, but the general arrangement has been considerably modified and much of the text rewritten. We have noted exceedingly few slips or omissions. The sections devoted to the United States have been notably improved, thanks to a diligent use of the *Guide to the Study of American History* and the *Library Journal*, but the account of the indexes to government publications would be more satisfactory if the author had used and cited Mr. Lane's article in the *Publications of the American Statistical Association* (Vol. VII., p. 40), and one is hardly prepared to find Professor Hart's *Source-Book* enumerated among bibliographies. On the European side, the author has overlooked the discontinuance, with the close of 1898, of the excellent bibliography of ecclesiastical history contained in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, and has not called attention to the helpful notes on medieval matters published in the *Neues Archiv*. Mention might well have been made of the various makeshifts to which one must resort in default of systematic current bibliographies of English and American history; indeed the lack of such bibliographies might well have given the opportunity for some comparisons not wholly to the credit of Anglo-American scholarship. When the *Manuel* first appeared, it was announced that the part devoted to the bibliographical tools would be followed by an account of the history and organization of historical studies since the Renaissance. The opening chapter of this second part is included in the present edition, and the remainder is promised shortly. Its early publication is highly desirable, both for its own sake and because the absence of an index and a table of contents seriously interferes with the use of the first part.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

A New Chapter in the Life of Thutmose III. By James Henry Breasted. (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, pp. 31.) Professor Breasted's practically new discovery of a text of forty-nine lines, hitherto lost from sight because Brugsch and Maspero, its earlier translators, had been misled into reading it backwards, is a valuable and brilliant contribution to our meagre knowledge regarding the early history of the great conquering king, Thutmose III. The inscription contains an account of his building enterprises and offerings. The introduction, which is published in this monograph with a translation and notes, tends to confirm the much contested conclusions of Sethe presented in his *Untersuchungen*, Band I. (1896), and furnishes further data for the reconstruction of the early Thutmoside reigns. It establishes the conjecture that Thutmose III. was not of royal blood. In his youth he was a priest in the Amon temple at Karnak and later became a prophet. Apparently his only claim to the throne came through his marriage with Hatshepsut, the influential daughter of the reigning king, Thutmose I. Her father also, it

seems, was reigning only by right of marriage with her mother, the royal princess Ahmose. When the queen died, Thutmose III., at a great feast, by collusion with his former associates the powerful Amonite priests, was publicly proclaimed king by the god, who uttered an oracle and transferred to him the royal duties in connection with the ritual. The suddenness and boldness of the dramatic *coup* left Thutmose I. without authority and Thutmose III. master of the throne. Only later did his wife Hatshepsut become co-regent with him. The absence of any allusion to her in the inscription suggests that it was written after her death in the sixteenth year of his reign. The reference to offerings made in his fifteenth year confirms this conclusion. On the other hand, the absence of any mention of his Asiatic campaigns, which began in his twenty-second year, establishes the date of this important inscription between his sixteenth and twenty-second year. Only on the basis of such scholarly, fundamental work as is found in this monograph, and of which in this especial field there has in the past been a woeful lack, can a reliable history of ancient Egypt be constructed.

CHARLES F. KENT.

The Legal Protection of Woman Among the Ancient Germans. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.] By William Rullkoetter. (University of Chicago Press, 1901, pp. 96.) This thesis is, aside from certain errors of style, of judgment and of conclusion, a useful summary of available material concerning the legal protection and the status of women among the ancient Germans. As to style, it is thoroughly unscientific; the writer is at once a special pleader and a panegyrist. He is the advocate for the superiority of the German people and the exponent of "The eternal womanly." All this would have been fitting in a popular article upon Teutonic women but is out of place in a doctor's dissertation. The author is sometimes carried beyond his depth by his advocacy and accepts too literally and credits too trustingly the statements of his authorities, the creditableness of some of which is at least open to question. Errors arise from his indiscriminate use of uncredited excerpts and his utter disregard of the element of time-of-occurrence in its relation to proof. In collecting data, Mr. Rullkoetter has shown great energy and he has accomplished much in gathering from old laws and records valuable information. He has shown skill in the fitting together of the myriad scraps that make up his mosaic, but he has not been so careful in matching their colors. His work is, therefore, a patchwork, neatly joined it is true, but abounding in discordant facts. Mr. Rullkoetter seems to use as his own work the foot-notes of standard authorities, and though, as far the present reviewer has verified these foot-notes, they are cited correctly, yet we should have preferred that our author's citations might have been wholly the result of his own investigation. In using illustration and fact Mr. Rullkoetter seems to have no appreciation of the effect of time and progress upon evidence. He will bolster up a theory

with an assortment of facts grouped in one paragraph with no reference as to their dates. Yet these may and do vary from the first century before Christ to the nineteenth century after, and have no more common bearing on the case than a general resemblance in external form. The author has divided his work into chapters. In each he shows a slavish adherence to one or two standard authorities and around the theory of these he has grouped the thoughts of other and sometimes differing authorities with strange and contradictory results.

Mr. Rullkoetter has, however, made a substantial addition to the apparatus by which we may conveniently study woman in the period he has chosen. He has laid a stable foundation for a work upon society in the early Germanic period. By this thesis he has shown ability to produce such a volume. We hope that this ability will find early opportunity and exercise.

GUY CARLETON LEE.

Under the title *Histoire de l'Inquisition au Moyen Âge* (Paris, Société Nouvelle de Librairie, 1900, Vol. I., pp. xl, 631) M. Salomon Reinach has begun a translation of Mr. Henry C. Lea's great work on the medieval inquisition. The idea of a French edition was suggested by the proceedings in the Dreyfus case, and the controversies growing out of it, and the publication at a low price is evidently designed to facilitate the use of the book as anti-clerical campaign literature. Mr. Lea has, however, insisted upon the preservation of the scientific spirit of the original, and the pointing of the modern moral is confined to an occasional footnote. In general the French version gives a satisfactory reproduction; some notes and corrections have been inserted by the author and translator, and the appendix of documents is omitted. Scholars familiar with the American edition will find most to interest them in the brief account of the "historiography of the inquisition" prepared for the translation by Professor Paul Fredericq of the University of Ghent, and those among us who take pride in this splendid monument of American scholarship will be gratified at the generous recognition which the eminent Belgian, himself one of the most distinguished historians of the inquisition, gives to Mr. Lea's work. Appearing in 1888, shortly after Molinier had pronounced such an undertaking almost chimerical, the *History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages* at once took rank as an accepted authority; and it still remains, in the words of a recent German critic whose opinion Fredericq quotes as the judgment of the specialists of every country, "the most extensive, the most profound, and the most thorough history of the inquisition which we possess." Fredericq concludes with an enumeration of the many special studies in this field which have been published in the past twelve years, and expresses the hope that Mr. Lea may some day bring out a second edition which will incorporate their results. Such a revision would be welcome, but a more pressing need is the great history of the Spanish inquisition upon which Mr. Lea has been so long engaged and which only he can write.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

A work which is intended primarily for Dante scholars, but which will be found very useful for every student of the thirteenth century in Italy is *Arte, Scienza e Fede ai Giorni di Dante* (Milan, Hoepli). It consists of eight lectures delivered last year by eminent specialists before the Dante Society of Milan. Thus Pasquale del Giudice deals with Italian feudalism, Nino Tamassia with the life of the people, and Luigi Rocca with the Papacy and the Church; Paul Sabatier writes with fervor in French on St. Francis and the religious movement; Professor Felice Tocco analyzes with extraordinary clearness the currents of philosophic thought; Michele Scherillo discusses Dante and the study of classic poetry; Francesco Novati describes court life and poetry; and Francesco Flamini treats of popular poets and poetry. Nor should the general introduction by Gaetano Negri, President of the Royal Lombard Institute, be overlooked. Each essay is followed by an appendix containing full notes and references which testify to the writers' scholarship. The literary excellence which characterizes most of the volume will surprise readers who have not kept pace with recent Italian progress in humane studies.

The eight treatises on Latin versification which Giovanni Mari has edited in *I Trattati Medievali di Rithmica Latina* (Milan, Hoepli) are of interest chiefly to students of medieval metrics. It is true that these treatises, like the similar manuals of prose composition, introduce a large number of illustrative examples, but the poetical value of such illustrations is very slight and they tell us provokingly little concerning the life of their time. Even the *Ars Rithmica* of Jean de Garlande, who took an active part in the busy life of the University of Paris and wrote voluminously on all kinds of grammatical and rhetorical subjects, is, like the rest of his bad verse, singularly disappointing to the student of medieval culture. Of course all this is no fault of Signore Mari; from a metrical point of view the texts deserved publication, and the edition gives evidence of the sound scholarship which we should expect from a pupil of so eminent a medievalist as Francesco Novati. There is abundant opportunity for work of this quality in the somewhat neglected field of medieval Latin literature.

C. H. H.

Lives of Great Italians, by Frank Horridge (London, T. Fisher Unwin; Boston, L. C. Page and Co.), is a volume of biographical essays on Dante, Petrarch, Carmagnola, Machiavelli, Michel Angelo Buonarroti, Galileo, Goldoni, Alfieri, Cavour and Victor Emanuel. The essays on Petrarch, Machiavelli and Michel Angelo fill nearly 300 of the 470 pages, but none of them has much value for the serious historical reader. Mr. Horridge seems painstaking, but he has neither the original point of view nor the incisive style required of a biographer who wishes to appeal to a popular audience.

The *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, new series, Vol. XIV. (Longmans, pp. 372), opens with a presidential address by Dr.

A. W. Ward. Mr. C. H. Firth essays a new account of the battle of Dunbar. A careful study of the old evidence, combined with the new evidence afforded by a contemporary picture-plan of the battle, which he has recently found in the Bodleian Library, and which he attributes to Payne Fisher, has led him to believe that the two armies were posted in a somewhat different position, and that the battle was fought in a somewhat different way, from what is generally supposed. Miss Kate Norgate discusses the evidence for the alleged condemnation of King John by the Court of France in 1202. She has adopted M. Bémont's conclusion that the condemnation of 1203 is fictitious, and believes that the condemnation of 1202 rests solely on Ralph Coggeshall and is likewise fictitious. Mr. Walter Frewen Lord, in an acute and learned essay, which won the Alexander prize for 1899, sets forth minutely the development of political parties during the reign of Queen Anne. He takes, without fully supporting it by positive evidence, a higher view of the queen's capacity and character than is usually assumed. Miss Frances G. Davenport illustrates the Decay of Villeinage in East Anglia, by a careful study of the unpublished records of the manor of Fornsett, co. Norfolk. Mrs. D'Arcy Collyer contributes Notes on the Diplomatic Correspondence between England and Russia, in the first half of the eighteenth century, which have a close relation to her volume of the papers of Lord Buckinghamshire, noticed on a previous page of the present volume (p. 587). Mr. C. Raymond Beazley discourses on the Pilgrimage of the Archimandrite Daniel of Kiev to the Holy Land about A.D. 1106-1107. Mr. W. J. Corbett discusses elaborately and in a very interesting manner the Tribal Hidage, printed in Birch's *Cartularium*, I. 414, and discussed of late by Professor Maitland in his *Domesday Book and Beyond*. The remainder of the volume is occupied with criticisms of I. S. Leadam's papers on the inquisitions of depopulation in 1517 and the *Domesday of Inclosures*. Mr. Edwin F. Gay criticizes Mr. Leadam's arguments as based on insufficient evidence; and Mr. Leadam replies.

Mr. A. J. Grant contributes two new volumes to the Cambridge Historical Series edited by Mr. G. W. Prothero on *The French Monarchy, 1483-1789* (Cambridge University Press, 1900, pp. 311, 314). He has succeeded in his purpose of giving "a fair and impartial account of the chief events of French history both domestic and foreign, during the period covered by these volumes." The wars foreign and civil fill at least half of the work, a proportion amply supported by tradition. The writer neither claims nor exhibits any originality, and contents himself in the main with a very clear and pertinent summary of what is to be found in the standard general treatises, French and English. He has neglected the technical contributions to the subject, which might have leavened the more discursive and popular treatises. There is no mention in his bibliography of Clamageran, Gomel or Babeau. The elder De Tocqueville's antiquated *Histoire Philosophique de Louis XV.* finds a place, but nothing is said of Jobez, who has used the archives to good

purpose. The best books leave us often at sea; why even mention popular accounts for the general reader, written with Gallic lightheartedness half a century since?

It is certainly a difficult task to give a satisfactory picture of the complicated organization of France in a single introductory chapter of sixteen pages. The author might, however, have appropriated for so important a matter some of the many succeeding pages devoted to foreign wars or at least have been more careful in his statements. It makes a bad impression to find at the very beginning that "the system of intendants dates from Richelieu" (even if the writer doubtfully takes it back later), that the nobles were exempt from the *gabelle*, and that "every one in France not belonging to the privileged classes had to buy a certain quantity of salt." Machiavelli is quoted as asserting that France had 146 bishoprics. There were but 121 dioceses in 1789, including the so-called "foreign clergy" and Corsica—and dioceses are strangely permanent divisions. The annates are defined as "the income of the first year after each new appointment."

Germany is spoken of as "torn by the Lutheran movement" before the election of Charles V., and Hadrian VI. is called a Spaniard, although the unfortunate Utrecht professor was towards sixty before he went south. Yet in spite of these slips the story is well told in the main, although it would seem with a somewhat heavy heart.

J. H. R.

The Protestant Interest in Cromwell's Foreign Relations (Heidelberg, 1900, pp. viii, 93) is the title of a Heidelberg thesis prepared by Dr. J. N. Bowman under the supervision of Professor Bernhard Erdmannsdörffer, whose sudden and unexpected death has recently been announced. If the subject is unusually broad for a doctor's thesis, it is also unusually interesting. Dr. Bowman was compelled to examine personally the greater part of the diplomatic papers of the Interregnum in order to sift out the material which had to do with his part of the subject. He very properly gave particular attention to the Protector's relations with the Baltic States, especially with Sweden, and made a journey to Stockholm to examine the Swedish archives. The material of greatest interest which he found there was the dispatches of the Swedish ambassadors in London, which have never been examined before from this point of view. One could wish that he had given us more copious extracts from them, since they have not been printed and are accessible only in the form of summaries in Kalling's valuable but scarce little work on Bonde's embassy and in Pufendorff's great work on Charles X. Dr. Bowman mentions Kalling but strangely fails to mention Pufendorff.

After a concise review of Cromwell's relations with the chief states of Europe, carefully noting in each case the rôle played by the Protestant interest, the author presents us with a convenient summary of his conclusions. It is well known that Cromwell lived in constant fear of the renewal of the religious wars and that he was anxious to unite the Protestant states in a general defensive alliance. While it is now known that

his fears were baseless, the union of such extended territories under the two branches of the Catholic house of Hapsburg lent some color to them. His religious zeal therefore very naturally found vent in an anti-Hapsburg policy, in which however the religious element was but one of several causes of antagonism, and in the author's opinion, by no means the dominant one. The Protestant interest was swallowed up in this anti-Hapsburg policy, and apart from this, the author believes, played no great rôle in the actual course of events. Or, as he expresses it, in speeches and in conversation the Protestant interest had first place, but it "loses this foremost position when looked at from the standpoint of his action and diplomacy." Dr. Bowman distinguishes however between this general Protestant interest, as he calls it, and the interference of Cromwell in favor of persecuted Protestants in Catholic states, where the Protector appears as the effective champion of toleration.

The pamphlet has the usual number of typographical errors to be expected in an English work printed in Germany, some of which unfortunately have crept into the foot-notes, making it not always easy to verify the references. There are, too, an astonishing number of inaccuracies in the quotations, which, though usually trifling in character, are nevertheless a distinct blemish. The pamphlet is to be recommended to all who are specially interested in the Cromwellian period. Unfortunately, it is already out of print.

GUERNSEY JONES.

A knowledge of Mazzini's writings is indispensable to an understanding of the undercurrents of European history and politics from 1830 to 1870, for he was not only the recognized leader of the "Revolution" in Italy and the chief foreign adviser of the French Reds, but he was also the friend of Herzen, the Russian revolutionist, and of the Spanish Republicans. An excellent volume of selections from Mazzini's writings has been made by Signora Jessie White Mario with the title *Scritti Scelti di Giuseppe Mazzini* (Florence, G. C. Sansoni). It contains representative specimens of Mazzini's personal, literary, political and philosophical writings. The historical student will find among them documents of great importance, such as the letter to Charles Albert, the Statutes of Young Italy, the terrific invective addressed to De Tocqueville and Falloux, and passages from some of the famous pamphlets, "Faith in the Future," "Italy and Rome," etc. Signora Mario adds greatly to the value of the selections by furnishing biographical and other notes, in which she gives from her personal knowledge many facts that hardly anyone else now living could give. So the volume is Mazzinian through and through.

Italian Influences. By Eugene Schuyler. (New York, Scribner, 1901, pp. 435.) This volume contains twenty-three articles by the late Eugene Schuyler. Three-quarters of them were contributed to the *Nation* in the years 1887-1889, and they all have a real cosmopolitan flavor, be-

fitting an author who was at home in many lands and cultivated in many literatures. They throw side-lights on several historical events, and are specially rich in literary gossip and allusion. Mr. Schuyler delighted to go to some out-of-the-way place and there read up at his leisure whatever of interest he could find about it. Thus at Albenga Madame de Genlis is his subject, at Savona he describes the captivity of Pope Pius VII., at San Benedetto he searches for news of some of the mountain lords of Dante's time. His paper on Prince Jem, son of Sultan Mohammed, and conspicuous in Italy as well as in the East at the end of the fifteenth century, contains, perhaps, more historical matter than any of the others. In the main, literary themes predominate. Thus, for instance, one paper is devoted to Landor on Italy, another to George Sand, a third to Dickens in Genoa, a fourth to Shelley with Byron. The story of Milton's Leonora, daughter of the "Siren" Adriana Basile, introduces us to the court life of the Gonzagas at Mantua, to the papal court under Clement IX., and to Paris in Mazarin's time. Madame de Staël and "Corinne," Désirée, wife of Bernadotte, Samuel Rogers, Hawthorne, Mrs. Browning, and Canova are discussed in other essays. There is an account of Europe and its saints, and of St. Simon of Trent, about whose martyrdom Mr. Schuyler unearths much quaint information. Purely descriptive is the essay on Castrocaro, a remote bath not far from Forlì; but even here Mr. Schuyler delves into the chronicles for the medieval history of the place, and he also speaks in passing of Passatore, famous as a bandit during the middle of the nineteenth century, and believed by the peasantry to be the son of Pius IX. and some duchess. Mr. Schuyler's description of the celebration of the University of Bologna in 1888 is vivid and vigorous, and contains a striking picture of Carducci delivering the great address of the festival. Papers on Bologna in the eighteenth century, on Carducci's Dante lectures, on Smollett in search of health, and on Canova, complete the contents of this very interesting volume, no mere summary of which can do justice to its interest. Mr. Schuyler's writing resembles the conversation of a cultivated gentleman, who tells a story, or criticizes a book, or communicates a bit of strange lore, not primarily to instruct but to entertain; and he succeeds. Essayists of this temper are always rare, particularly at a time when specialism tends to turn out men who are too emphatic to be genial, and too cautious to be enthusiastic. Mr. Schuyler's book ought to be indispensable to any one who travels intelligently in Italy. An excellent index puts its miscellaneous information within reach of everybody.

W. R. T.

Eugene Schuyler; Selected Essays. With a memoir by Evelyn Schuyler Schaeffer (Scribner, 1901, pp. 364). Though this volume scarcely touches on historical themes, it gives us a vivacious and pleasing sketch of the life of one whose well-known works on *Peter the Great*, *Turkestan* and *American Diplomacy* justly entitle him to recognition in this magazine. The Memoir, gracefully written with the affectionate

and sympathetic spirit of a sister, occupies more than half of the volume, and forms its most valuable feature. Copious extracts from Mr. Schuyler's letters and diary gives us vivid pictures of his busy life in many lands and disclose his temper and spirit. Consul at Moscow, at Revel, at Birmingham, secretary of legation at St. Petersburg, consul-general at Constantinople and at Rome, chargé d'affaires at Bucharest, minister to Greece, Servia and Roumania, diplomatic agent and consul-general at Cairo, his varied experiences furnished a rich harvest to his eager and acquisitive mind. Facile in mastering languages, intensely interested in the political complications of Eastern Europe, possessed of rare social gifts, by his letters and his despatches he threw a flood of light on the events which made his period of public service in the East interesting and important.

Doubtless the most valuable public service which he rendered was the presentation to Europe and the world of the first authentic and official description of the massacres of Bulgarians by the Turks in 1876. Sir Henry Elliot, the British ambassador at Constantinople, refused to give credence to the reports sent by missionaries in Bulgaria of the cruelty of the Turks. Great Britain was at that time earnestly supporting the Turkish government, and was unwilling that it should be condemned by English public opinion. Mr. Schuyler, then consul-general at Constantinople, visited Bulgaria to see with his own eyes what had happened. His report startled all Europe, and prepared it to expect the Russo-Turkish war which followed.

During his journey into Central Asia which prepared him to write his *Turkestan*, his sharp eye detected malfeasance on the part of high Russian officials, and he made known the leading facts. As he was then secretary of legation at St. Petersburg, he might well have expected to hear some complaints from the Russian government. To its credit be it said, the government instead of censuring him called some of its delinquent officers to account.

The most important of the three essays in the volume is one describing a visit to Tolstoi. The last one, on "The Lost Plant," indicates that Mr. Schuyler would in all probability have produced successful works in fiction, if he had given himself to that branch of literature.

He was buried at Venice, where he suddenly died at the age of fifty. Had his life been spared, we cannot but think that he might have filled some of the more important diplomatic posts with advantage to his country. He would doubtless have made further valuable contributions to our literature.

J. B. A.

The second volume of the *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology* contains two papers: the first by Cosmos Mindeleff is entitled "Navaho Houses," the second by Dr. J. Walter Fewkes, "Archaeological Expedition to Arizona in 1895." A brief description of the large Navaho Reservation is given and the opinion expressed that those Navahos west of the divide are superior in culture to those east

of it. They are not nomadic by nature but by necessity, for the conditions of the climate require a seasonal migration to and from the mountains for those who pursue the principal vocation of the tribe, namely, herding sheep and goats. Unlike the pueblo Amerinds the families live separately in scattered and hidden "hogans." The horses and cattle belong to the men and everything else to the women. The old clan boundaries are disappearing but each family has a definite locality where its flocks may graze and where water may be obtained, the latter being the key to the distribution of the people as it is everywhere throughout the Southwest. There is an unbroken range of these hogans from the merest summer shelter to the well-built winter hut with its framework of timbers and covering of earth. The details of the buildings and the ceremonies attending their dedication are described. The housewarmings are of a social and religious character, but they are being abandoned and even the house itself is losing its typical character and assuming the white man's pattern.

The greater part of the volume is devoted to Dr. Fewkes's paper which describes the ruins of two localities: Verde Valley and Tusayan. After giving a classification of the ruins the author supplements the account of the Verde ruins by Cosmos Mindeleff in the *Thirteenth Annual Report* by a description of the cliff-houses of the Red-rocks. The general features of the Tusayan ruins are outlined and two ruins, Awatobi and Sikyatki, which were thoroughly explored, are described at length. Awatobi was destroyed in 1700 and therefore falls within the historic period for Tusayan, but Sikyatki is wholly prehistoric. The latter lies nearer the present inhabited pueblos but not much traditional knowledge concerning it is retained by the Hopi. From both ruins many beautiful specimens of pottery were obtained that far excel the best fictile products of the modern villages. Most of this ware was obtained from the cemeteries. It may be classified as: 1. Coiled and indented ware; 2. Smooth undecorated ware; 3. Polished decorated ware; a. Yellow. b. Red. c. Black-and-white. Dr. Fewkes devotes about half the paper to the "palaeography of the pottery." The ceramic ware from Sikyatki is especially rich in picture-writing and he gives a very ingenious interpretation of the manners, customs and religious conceptions of the Sikyatkians from this source. A surprisingly large number of symbols were employed by these ancient Hopi and their decipherment would be an all but hopeless task to anyone less familiar with their modern survivals than Dr. Fewkes. It is noteworthy that symbolism rather than realism was the predominant feature of this archaic decoration. Few representations of the human figure are found and the author is of the opinion that its portrayal was of late development in Hopi art: such examples as are found occur in the interior of food-basins. Figures of quadrupeds are not abundant, reptiles are not very common and resemble those appearing in modern decoration. Figures of butterflies and moths are numerous and sometimes quite realistic though usually symbolized by triangles as at the present day upon wedding blankets and the like.

The paper is elaborately illustrated, many of the plates being colored reproductions of hand paintings. While the paper is a model of scientific description nevertheless the style is entertaining and trenchant.

FRANK RUSSELL.

Thomas Jefferson, by Thomas E. Watson. [Beacon Biographies.] (Boston: Small, Maynard and Co., 1900, pp. xv, 150.) In reading this attractive sketch it is of interest and of importance to keep in mind its author's position of leadership in a party which claims Jefferson as its founder.

A brief chronological table and a descriptive bibliography will prove serviceable to the many whom Mr. Watson's graceful introduction will incite to a closer acquaintance with his hero. However brief, the bibliography should not have failed to mention Ford's edition of Jefferson's *Writings*.

The man's portrait is sketched with telling strokes. It is remarkable that so few pages can give so comprehensive an understanding of the immense versatility of the man, of the range of his interests and information, and of his great and manifold services to state and nation. But Mr. Watson is master of a style at once terse and vivid; it is to be regretted that it is also not infrequently both undignified and intemperate.

Jefferson's failings are treated with a remarkable lightness of touch; indeed his innocence is at times emphasized at the expense of his insight. Scant acknowledgment is made of any constructive work upon which Jefferson was privileged to build. The most extended reference to Washington is an anecdote the sole point of which is to make "his own personal brand of austere dignity" seem ridiculous in comparison with Jefferson's loose unconventionality. Of the many allusions to Hamilton there is but one that is not acrid and atrabilious. He is ever the "political trader," the "adventurer," the "upstart," who with "his corrupt squadron of henchmen" is "striving to put the United States under the heels of Great Britain." In every feature of Hamilton's financial policy Mr. Watson can see nothing but a British enormity which Hamilton servilely imported with the deliberate intention that here "as in England," it might "fix a perpetual debt, an everlasting burden on the back of 'the mob' who were thus held in bondage from age to age, laboring patiently for those who owned the debt."

In short, Mr. Watson's avowed purpose, "to steer clear of the controversial,"—a thing almost impossible in narrating the life of one of the greatest of party leaders,—finds its accomplishment only in the heaping of epithets and innuendoes upon Jefferson's opponents. He has "tried to write just as the truth seems to be;" but it may be questioned whether the smoke of the political battle has not distorted the vision.

GEORGE H. HAYNES.

Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, seventh series, Vol. I. (Boston, the Society, pp. xxxviii, 389). Upon the first exami-

nation of this volume of "Jefferson Papers" one cannot wholly escape a feeling of disappointment that no more has been printed of the collection. Mr. Coolidge's gift to the Society, of the letters not embraced in the mass purchased by the federal government in 1848, included three thousand or more letters. Hardly more than 200 are here printed. It is true that the act of 1848 intended that the line should be drawn between public and private papers, and that these are mostly private. Yet one cannot help feeling that a society which, in its volumes of the Winthrop Papers, seemed disposed to print much that was insignificant, might have given us more of the letters of and to Jefferson. But 1800 is not of equal importance with 1700 in the eyes of historical societies, and we must be grateful for what we have. We certainly have a very interesting volume. The varied interests of the many-sided Jefferson,—interests political, literary, scientific, educational, and agricultural—all find illustration. The letters addressed to him are about as numerous as those from his pen. The series begins in 1770, and ends but a month before Jefferson's death. The last dozen letters, between the old man and his granddaughter and her husband, living in Boston, are particularly pleasing in their pictures of New England conditions and their evidence of Jefferson's interest in them. Of earlier letters, there is especial interest in those of Stockdale, the London publisher, relative to the *Notes on Virginia*, in one from Eli Whitney, relating to his great invention, and in nearly a score of excellent letters from William Short. There is a letter from the wife of Jefferson's old friend John Page, which shows curious plans made for Page's last months and for the education of his children, by continuing the office of commissioner of loans to him or to members of the family or rich friends, Thomas Taylor or Benjamin Harrison of Berkley, who would agree to turn over the salary to Mrs. Page. Letters from Thomas Cooper are always vivacious. Also, there are letters from George Ticknor and others, concerning the University.

Of the strictly political letters of Jefferson himself, the most interesting is that of June 1, 1798, to John Taylor of Caroline, the famous letter in which Jefferson dissuades from disunion suggested on the ground of the Alien and Sedition Laws. That it has been printed before, in all three of the collections of Jefferson's writings, is no bar to its being printed here, for it is not printed correctly in any of the three. The tale is a curious one. In the Randolph edition of 1829, made mostly from press copies, Jefferson quotes Taylor as having said "that it was not unwise now to estimate the separate mass of Virginia and North Carolina, with a view to their separate existence" (III. 393). In the Washington edition, (IV. 245), the reading is the same. Mr. Ford, (VII. 263), prints the same words (1896). In 1894 Mr. W. W. Henry, who in his *Patrick Henry* had on the basis of this letter called Taylor "a confessed disunionist," retracted the expression in a communication to the *Virginia Magazine*, (I. 325), having learned, from a note of George Tucker's in the *Southern Literary Messenger* for 1838 (II. 344) that the true reading should be "that it was not *unusual* now," etc., a very dif-

ferent statement. Mr. Henry's note escaped Mr. Ford's notice, but learning of Tucker's before his seventh volume came out, he has inserted a slip, incorrectly giving Tucker's reading as "that it is not *usual* now," and adding that no proof is produced beyond the "mere assertion of Mr. Tucker," and that, the press-copy having been destroyed, "it is now impossible to verify the facts." In the volume now under review, the letter is printed from the original sent to John Taylor. It reads "un-usual." There are other important differences between this and the Randolph text. The notes to this volume do not show close familiarity with the Virginia of Jefferson's time.

The Life of James Dwight Dana, Scientific Explorer, Mineralogist, Geologist, Zoologist, Professor in Yale University, by Daniel C. Gilman, President of the Johns Hopkins University. (Harper, 1899, pp. xii, 409.) This book will be welcomed by multitudes of former students at Yale, who remember Professor Dana with reverence and affection, as well as by his personal and professional friends in many lands. It is the life-story of a remarkable man, and the narrative displays all the sympathy and catholicity of spirit, the versatility of mind and the vivacity of style for which President Gilman is noted. The work is embellished with several portraits of Dana, and contains in a second part a considerable selection from his scientific correspondence with Darwin, Gray, Agassiz and others.

Professor Dana was undoubtedly a great man, in endowment, in character, in industry, and in the impulse given by him to scientific studies in America. Yet somehow, one hardly knows why, he does not seem so impressive a figure in this biography as he did in the flesh. Perhaps this is due to the fact that the material of the book is spread out somewhat thinly, and in places diluted or supplemented by matter only remotely related to its subject. Perhaps it is due to the fact that several of the themes with which Dana was earnestly engaged, in science, philanthropy and theology, no longer interest us or have taken on different forms. Possibly it may be due in part to the inevitable comparison suggested between the subject of the book and so epoch-making a mind as Darwin. Nevertheless, no one can read the work without gaining a fresh sense alike of Dana's intellectual and moral greatness, and of the immense and beneficent advance in science which, during the sixty years of his activity, he witnessed and did so much to stimulate and direct.

The de Forests of Avesnes (and of New Netherland); A Huguenot Thread in American Colonial History, by J. W. De Forest (New Haven: The Tuttle, Morehouse and Taylor Co., 1900, pp. xx, 288). In the preface the author disclaims any intention of producing a complete family history of the Avenese de Forests in Europe and America, which he declares a more serious labor than he cares to confront. He states his purpose to be merely "to discover the origin of the family,

and to trace it from that origin down to its establishment in the New World; to indicate the lineage which sprang from the ancestral emigrant, and to push one lineage down to the middle of the nineteenth century." His book is therefore chiefly genealogical in character, and is of special interest only to readers belonging to or connected with the De Forest family. The completeness of the information here given appears to be largely enhanced by researches instituted by the author not only among the rare books but among the manuscripts of European libraries, some of them seldom consulted by students. To the general reader the chief value of the book is connected with the three or four chapters bearing upon the first colonization of New Amsterdam, the present New York. It was shown by Dr. Charles W. Baird, in his *History of the Huguenot Emigration to America*, that the "Walloons and Frenchmen" (Huguenots) from Leyden who sailed from Holland to the mouth of the Hudson in 1623 (1624) were in all probability the same, with few exceptions, as the company for whom Jesse de Forest and his associates, a little over a year before, had sought permission of the King of England, through the English ambassador to the Netherlands, to settle somewhere in Virginia, that monarch's domains in the New World. Their petition is still extant, and Baird printed it, together with a photographic copy of the round-robin, signed by the petitioners with their own hands, which is still preserved in the British Public Record Office. Unfortunately no similar list of the company that actually went to New Netherland under the auspices of the Dutch States General is known to be in existence. The author of the present volume himself (page 65) is reluctantly compelled to confess: "De Forest's report of his enrollment of colonists has been sought for in vain by the Hague officials." He has been equally unsuccessful in solving the question where his ancestor died; for it is clear that whereas Jesse de Forest seems to have been the prime mover both in the application to the English and in that to the Dutch, he never reached New Amsterdam himself, though members of his family and his son-in-law, De la Montagne, did. The author thinks it probable that he died in South America.

Lieutenant-Colonel Cruikshank of Fort Erie continues his *Documentary History of the Campaign on the Niagara Frontier in 1812* by a new part (pp. 344, published by the Lundy's Lane Historical Society) marked Part IV. on the cover, Part II. on the title-page, and covering the months of October, November and December. The collection of documents is elaborate, and seems complete. They are derived from the Canadian archives and those of the State of New York, but also in large part from books and newspapers in wide variety.

Mr. Leonard Magruder Passano, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a Marylander, has written for school use a small *History of*

Maryland (Baltimore, W. J. C. Dulany Co., pp. 245) which has many excellences. It is very brief; the narrative text is of but 180 pages, and many of these are occupied with pictures (the portraits not well executed). The narrative is well written, conspicuously free from all false notes of exaggerated American or Maryland patriotism, fair and sensible. It is composed, too, with remarkable intelligence as to what matters are worth including in a text-book, and what are the best traits in the character and career of the colony and state. It is not the conventional school-book. The list of books for reading might well be extended and annotated. The present constitution of Maryland, a very long document, is printed in an appendix. This is now not unusual in text-books of state history; but it may be questioned whether children get any good from the full details of most parts of these now verbose instruments, and whether it would not be a better plan to give the full text of the most important provisions, and summaries of the rest.

School History of Mississippi, for use in Public and Private Schools, by Franklin L. Riley, Ph.D., Professor of History, University of Mississippi, Secretary of the Mississippi Historical Society. (Richmond, Va.: B. F. Johnson Publishing Co., 1900, pp. 348 and appendix.) Professor Riley's book is intended for a secondary school text-book. The author has been very successful in sketching the varied episodes of Mississippi's history in clear and strong outlines. The narrative is not overburdened with details. The literary style is simple and unadorned. The illustrations are fair and the maps very good. Some of them are copies of originals which are contemporary with the facts which they are used to illustrate.

Prominent in the early history of Mississippi is the question of its southern boundary, which was not extended to the Gulf until 1810-1812. The territorial period (1802-1817) culminated in separation from the settlements on the Tombigbee and statehood for the western half. The period from 1817 to 1850 is the most peculiar and diversified. The Indian titles were extinguished; the northern counties were organized; the southern counties lost their political preponderance; and jealous sectionalism prevailed until it was swallowed up in the pride which the state justly felt in the career of its gallant First Regiment under Colonel Jefferson Davis in the Mexican war. This was also the period of the democratized constitution (1832); of banks, "flush times" and repudiation; and of the limitation of the interstate slave traffic. The question of secession occupied the whole of the decade before the war.

It is only in the treatment of the very last period, "A Decade of Progress (1890-1900)," that Professor Riley is disappointing. A stranger would not suspect from his statements how critical one of the innovations in the new constitution was nor why Senator George needed to make a brilliant defence of the state in Congress. Why does the author not state plainly that the Mississippians were dissatisfied with universal manhood suffrage and give a fair and candid account of their rea-

sons therefor? The new provisions have now been in operation for ten years and seem to give general satisfaction to those who made them. It would seem that the question is a closed one in the state. Do not the children of the state, both white and black, deserve to know the very best reasons for the step? If the people outside of the state still have two opinions about it, all the more reason why a state historian who is so fair as Professor Riley has shown himself to be in all other topics should describe it fully and dispassionately.

FREDERICK W. MOORE.

Vol. III. of the *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society* (pp. 380) edited by the secretary, Professor Franklin L. Riley, and printed for the society at Oxford, Mississippi, contains several substantial contributions to a knowledge of the history of the State. Easily first in importance in civil history are Mr. Riley's own papers, well "documentirt," on the Location of the Boundaries of Mississippi, and on the Transition from Spanish to American Control in that region, and a history of banking in Mississippi by Professor Charles H. Brough. Dr. Eugene W. Hilgard's account of the Geological and Agricultural Survey of Mississippi is also of value. A high importance must attach to General Stephen D. Lee's papers on the Campaign of Vicksburg, from April 15 to the battle of Champion Hills, May 16, 1863, inclusive, and on the siege. There are some biographical papers which are useful—and some rhetorical papers which are not.

Nova Scotia Archives, II. A Calendar of Two Letter-Books and One Commission-Book in the Possession of the Government of Nova Scotia, 1713-1741. Edited by Archibald M. MacMechan, Ph.D., Professor of English Language and Literature at Dalhousie College (Halifax, pp. 270). In 1868 the late Dr. T. B. Akins brought out, at the instance of the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia, a volume of documents from those provincial archives which he had collected, arranged, bound, indexed and catalogued with so much care. Upon recent representations from the Nova Scotia Historical Society, Dr. MacMechan was employed to edit another volume from the same collection of documents. Those pieces which he has chosen are among the oldest possessed by the province, and were in some danger of perishing. They are also of high intrinsic value. The first two are letter-books kept at Annapolis, 1713-1717 and 1717-1742, by Caulfeild and subsequent governors, and a commission-book, kept there from May, 1720, to December, 1741, containing also many orders, proclamations, instructions, etc. The processes of English government in Nova Scotia during the era of Walpole are well illustrated by the volume.

A plan of Annapolis Royal and the fort at the time of the capture in 1710 is added from a contemporary manuscript. The book is edited in a careful and scholarly manner.

A TRIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF AMERICAN DIPLOMACY

I. PRINCIPLES.

THE sources for the study of American foreign relations are very abundant, and there are many general treatises on international law. Secondary narratives are now coming forward in considerable numbers, and the publication of monographs has begun. As yet, however, no one has attempted a systematic bibliography of the subject; and the investigator is swamped by the very wealth of his materials.

It has therefore seemed worth while to classify, enumerate and describe the most serviceable books and collections bearing on American diplomacy, though space does not allow any attempt to include the large literature of periodical articles, or to analyze the collections either topically or chronologically. This bibliography is therefore simply a check-list of the more accessible books, with such brief comment as may show their value and their bearing. In most cases works which are out of print or otherwise unavailable, however valuable, are not included. For the investigator a path may be found deeper into the literature, and to special topics, through the bibliographical aids mentioned below, and through the footnotes to treatises on international law, and narratives, histories and monographs.

Works of especial significance and usefulness are noted by an asterisk (*).

The list is not confined to the diplomacy of the United States since 1775. In the sense of the bibliography American diplomacy begins with the relations of the colonizing European countries with each other at the time of its discovery; follows out the rival claims to territory in the new world, and the treaties of delimitation; deals with commerce and the external regulation of colonial commerce, especially with other American settlements; discusses intercolonial correspondence and plans of union; describes the wars by land and sea in America during the eighteenth century, ending with the exclusion of France in 1763; and then proceeds to the foundation of a foreign office, a foreign system and a foreign policy by the Continental Congress, and thus to the diplomacy of the Federal Republic in all its ramifications.

II. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AIDS.

The general bibliographies of American history include most of the special books on diplomacy down to about 1895, although none of them except Winsor has a distinct section on the subject. Thus Channing and

Hart, *Guide to the Study of American History* (Boston, 1897), includes lists of indexes to public documents (§ 16e); general comprehensive works (§ 20); sources of historical geography (§ 21d); biographies (§ 25); colonial records (§ 29); works of statesmen (§ 32); autobiographies (§ 33); collections of documents (§ 34); and topical references from 1492 down to 1865 (§§ 144-214). W. E. Foster, *References to the History of Presidential Administrations, 1789-1885* (N. Y., 1885), includes diplomatic materials; Bowker and Iles, *The Readers' Guide in Economic, Social and Political Science* (New York, 1891), collects some titles on pages 119-123. See also the section below on Treatises on International Law.

The following volumes have lists of books, more or less systematic, either on diplomacy in general (with such classification as makes it easy to select material on America); or on American foreign affairs only.

*Charles Calvo, *Le Droit International Théorique et Pratique*, 6 vols., (Paris, 1887-1896).—Includes an elaborate study of the literature of international law, including sources; especially Vol. I., 101-138; Vol. VI. ("Supplément Général"), xxix-lxi.

William I. Fletcher, editor, *The "A. L. A." Index, An Index to General Literature* (Boston, 1893).—An attempt to index volumes of collected essays and like materials containing specific chapters on special questions.

W. I. Fletcher and R. R. Bowker, *The Annual Literary Index* (New York, 1893).—This is a supplement to both Poole and the "A. L. A." Index, in annual volumes (beginning with the year 1892), indexing periodicals, essays, book chapters, etc., in classified entries.

*A. P. C. Griffin, *List of Books (with references to Periodicals) relating to the Theory of Colonization, Government of Dependencies, Protectorates and related Topics* (Library of Congress, Division of Bibliography, 2d ed., Washington, 1900).—Especially serviceable on the latest diplomatic questions.

Franz de Holtzendorff and Alphonse Rivier, *Introduction au Droit des Gens* (Paris, 1889).—Part IV. of this work (pp. 351-494) is a discussion of the literature of international law, by groups, especially: English authors (§ 116); American authors (§ 117); Spanish-American and Brazilian authors (§ 119).

*Leonard Augustus Jones, *An Index to Legal Periodical Literature*, 2 vols., (Boston, 1888, 1899).—Vol. I. indexes a hundred and fifty-eight sets of periodicals down to 1886; Vol. II. indexes a few sets before 1887 which were omitted in Vol. I. and then brings down the work to cover 1887-1898, including many articles from general periodicals. The work is indispensable to the searcher for discussions on special topics.

*Josephus Nelson Larned, editor, *The Literature of American History, A Bibliographical Guide* (? 1902).—A classified bibliography of American history in general; about two thousand titles, each annotated by an expert.

*John Bassett Moore, *History and Digest of International Arbitrations to which the United States has been a Party*, 6 vols., (Washington, 1898).

—List of authorities, I. lxxxiii–xcviii ; list of cases, I. lxiii–lxxxvii ; the footnotes throughout are a most valuable guide to materials, and especially to official correspondence.

* William Frederick Poole, William I. Fletcher and others, editors, *Poole's Index to Periodical Literature, 1802–1881*, 2 vols., rev. ed. (Boston, 1893). *First Supplement, 1882–1886* (Boston, 1888); *Second Supplement, 1887–1891* (Boston, 1893); *Third Supplement, 1892–1896* (Boston, 1897).—A well known and invaluable series of guides to the numerous valuable articles, often by experts, in periodicals.

* United States, *Treaties and Conventions concluded between the United States of America and other Powers* (Washington, 1889).—To this volume Mr. J. C. Bancroft Davis has appended (pp. 1217–1406) very valuable historical notes, with detailed references to government publications and some other sources.

* Francis Wharton, *Digest of the International Law of the United States*, 3 vols., (Washington, 1886).—The references in this work are practically a classified bibliography of official source-material. See especially Vol. I., pp. iii–ix, “Preliminary remarks.”

* Justin Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, 8 vols., (Boston, 1886–1889). Includes a critical discussion of authorities down to about 1850 (VII. 461–562) ; an account of the manuscript sources of American history, including archives (VIII. 413–468) ; and an appendix on comprehensive printed authorities (VIII. 469–507).

III. SECONDARY WORKS.

In every field of diplomacy the ground has been to some degree gone over by text-writers in international law, and by general historians ; of late years a literature of special treatises and monographs has sprung up. Out of all these discussions a choice has been made in the list below of those which have most reference to American conditions and experience, which have the most useful footnotes and bibliographies, and which, from the character of their authors or from their freshness and originality, seem likely to be most to the point. Many of the secondary books also contain source-materials, in appendices or extracts.

A. General Works on American Diplomacy.

There is no one work covering the whole field of American diplomacy, both the colonial and federal periods. The following books include parts of the subject and are useful for a general survey. None of them is provided with elaborate footnotes.

William Eleroy Curtis, *The United States and Foreign Powers* (New York, 1899).—This is a little book which includes a sketch of the diplomatic service ; chapters on Latin-American relations, the Monroe Doctrine and the interoceanic canal ; and then a study of the relations of the United States with the various foreign powers in succession. It is not a consecutive work, nor marked by deep knowledge of international law.

John W. Foster, *A Century of American Diplomacy, 1776-1876* (Boston and New York, 1900).—This is a general study of American diplomacy by a distinguished diplomat, with a special chapter on the Monroe Doctrine from the conventional point of view. The book is strongest on the diplomacy since the Civil War.

* John Holladay Latané, *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States and Spanish America* (Baltimore, 1900).—Though including only one field of American foreign affairs, this is one of the handiest and best books on inter-American relations. Well printed, with footnotes.

* Theodore Lyman, *The Diplomacy of the United States, Being an Account of the Foreign Relations of the Country from the First Treaty with France in 1778*, 2d ed., 2 vols., (Boston, 1828).—This is a more elaborate attempt to treat American diplomacy as a separate subject, but it was written before the publication of some important materials. It comes down to 1828, including relations with Barbary powers and Latin-American states.

Alfred Thayer Mahan, *The Interest of America in Sea Power, Present and Future* (Boston, 1897). A discussion by an expert on our foreign commercial and diplomatic policy.

* John Bassett Moore, *American Foreign Policy*. (In preparation.)—This work by an experienced diplomat, when published, will include classified bibliographies, and will cover briefly the whole field of American diplomacy.

* Eugene Schuyler, *American Diplomacy and the Furtherance of Commerce* (New York, 1886).—This is a suggestive book devoted to commercial relations, written by a man who had had much experience in the consular service.

Freeman Snow, *Treaties and Topics in American Diplomacy* (Boston, 1890).—Half of this book is an abstract of treaties; the other half is made up of essays on the Monroe Doctrine, the Fisheries and the Bering Sea question.

William Henry Trescot, *The Diplomacy of the Revolution. An Historical Study* (New York, 1852). *The Diplomatic History of the Administrations of Washington and Adams, 1789-1801* (Boston, 1857).—These two books taken together are a serviceable account of the quarter-century from the beginning of the Revolution to the administration of Jefferson. Almost no footnotes.

B. General Histories containing Discussions of Diplomatic Topics.

From the numerous histories concerning considerable areas of American history the following have been selected as furnishing the largest and most pertinent discussions of foreign relations.

* Henry Adams, *History of the United States during the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison*, 9 vols., (New York, 1889-1891).—A most searching account of the diplomacy of neutral trade and the War of 1812.

George Bancroft, *A History of the United States*, first ed., 12 vols., (Boston, 1834-1874).—From discovery to 1789. Some of the volumes of this edition have footnotes.

* Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of the Pacific States of North America*, 34 vols., (San Francisco, 1882-1890).—Great detail on the Spanish settlements and colonial controversies with the French and English; also on the annexations of Texas, California, Oregon and Alaska.

Montagu Burrows, *The History of the Foreign Policy of Great Britain* (New York, 1895).

John Andrew Doyle, *The English in America, The Puritan Colonies*, 2 vols., (London, 1887-1888); *English Colonies in America, Virginia, Maryland and the Carolinas* (New York, 1880).—A standard history of American colonization, including diplomatic relations.

* Richard Hildreth, *The History of the United States of America*, 6 vols., revised edition (New York, 1854-1855).—Some narrative and diplomatic discussions of the colonial epoch, and of the main issues under the federal government down to 1820.

William Kingsford, *The History of Canada, 1608-1841*, 10 vols., (London, 1887-1898).

* William Edward Hartpole Lecky, *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, 8 vols., (London, 1878-1890).—Some account of the eighteenth-century diplomacy relative to America.

* Alfred Thayer Mahan, *The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783* (Boston, 1890).—An epoch-making book indispensable for an understanding of the wars and diplomacy of the eighteenth century, as they affected America.

Alfred Thayer Mahan, *The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire, 1793-1812*, 2 vols., (Boston, 1892).—A supplement to the above volume; relates to America through the discussions of neutral trade.

* James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States from 1850*, 4 vols., (New York, 1893- —).—Includes a most excellent discussion of the diplomacy of the United States just before and during the Civil War. Still in progress.

James Schouler, *History of the United States*, new ed., 6 vols., (New York, 1895-1900).—Brief account of diplomatic relations as a part of the general history of the United States from 1783 to 1865.

Sir John Robert Seeley, *The Expansion of England: Two Courses of Lectures* (Boston, 1883).—An account of the colonization policy of Great Britain, and its effect on England.

* Sir John Robert Seeley, *The Growth of British Policy, An Historical Essay*, 2 vols., (Cambridge, 1895).—Covers the field from 1588 to 1714; brings out the foreign relations of England on the colonial side.

Edward Smith, *England and America after Independence: A Short Examination of their International Intercourse, 1783-1872*. (Westminster, 1900.)

* Justin Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, 8 vols., (Boston, 1886-1889).—The work abounds throughout in footnotes and critical discussions of authorities. See especially Vol. III., chs. i.-iv., on the first English claims and settlements; Vol. IV., on the French, Dutch

and Swedes in America ; Vol. V., ch. i., on Canada and Louisiana, chs. vii.-viii., on French and Indian Wars down to 1763 ; Vol. VII., chs. i., ii., on the diplomacy of the Revolution ; ch. vii., on diplomacy from 1789 to 1880.

Justin Winsor, *Christopher Columbus, and how He Received and Imparted the Spirit of Discovery* (Boston, 1891) ; *Cartier to Frontenac : Geographical Discovery in the Interior of North America in its Historical Relations, 1534-1700* (Boston, 1894) ; *The Mississippi Basin ; the Struggle in America between England and France, 1697-1763* (Boston, 1895) ; *The Westward Movement ; The Colonies and the Republic West of the Alleghanies, 1763-1798* (Boston, 1897).—These four volumes are the best systematic account of the rivalries for the possession of America, including some diplomatic questions.

C. Treatises on International Law.

Many of the most valuable works on international relations are treatises on international law, especially those written by Americans, or with special reference to America. Lists of such treatises may be found in T. A. Walker, *Science of International Law*, pp. vii-xvi ; Theodore D. Woolsey, *International Law* (6th ed.), pp. 405 *et seq.* ; especially in Charles Calvo, *Droit International*, I. 101-138, VI. xxix-lxi. Holtzendorff, Calvo, Phillimore and Pradier-Fodéré are the fullest authorities, and, in the last editions, are among the most recent. They all freely use American precedents. The best treatises as aids to a study of American diplomacy are the following :

* Charles Calvo, *Le Droit International Théorique et Pratique* (Paris, 6 vols., 1880 ; 5th ed., 1887-1896).—An exhaustive treatise written by an Argentine diplomat. Vol. I., pp. 1-101, contains a brief sketch of general diplomatic history down to 1887.

Garden, Count Guillaume de, *Histoire Générale de Traités de Paix*, 15 vols., (Paris, 1848-1887).—Covers the period 1536 to 1815, and is a history of the events leading up to each treaty, but does not contain the texts.

William Edward Hall, *International Law* (Oxford, 1880 ; 3d edition, 1890).—Perhaps the best one-volume treatise. Many references to American precedents.

Henry W. Halleck, *International Law* (1870, Sir Sherstone Baker's edition, 1878).—Written by the former general-in-chief of the United States army. Dry but thoughtful and well analyzed. Frequent references to American precedent.

* Franz von Holtzendorff, *Handbuch des Völkerrechts auf Grundlage Europäischer Staatspraxis*, 4 vols., (Berlin, 1885-1889).—A co-operative work by eminent publicists. Abundant references to other treatises, and very numerous precedents, with reference to sources.

James Kent, *Commentaries on American Law* (New York, 1826-1830 ; 12th ed., by O. W. Holmes, 1873 ; J. T. Abdy's 2d ed., 1877).—The treatise on international law is in Volume I.

Thomas Joseph Lawrence, *The Principles of International Law* (Boston, 1895).—One of the most recent text-books.

Sir Robert Phillimore, *Commentaries on International Law*, 4 vols., (London, 1854; 3d ed., 1879-1899).—The most detailed and exhaustive work in English; with elaborate references.

John Norton Pomeroy, *Lectures on International Law in Time of Peace* (Theodore S. Woolsey's ed., 1886).—Reprint of lectures delivered in 1866-1867. Few references to sources.

Paul Louis Ernest Pradier-Fodéré, *Traité de Droit International Public Européen et Américain, suivant les Progrès de la Science et de la Pratique Contemporaine*, 7 vols., (Paris, 1885-1897).—Still incomplete; refers to late incidents and precedents; clumsy arrangement and references, not very serviceable. Many allusions to Latin-American affairs.

Thomas Alfred Walker, *The Science of International Law* (London, 1893).—Brief, clear and abounds in illustrations from recent historical events.

*Francis Wharton, *Commentaries on Law, embracing Chapters on the Nature, the Source, and the History of Law, on International Law, Public and Private, and on Constitutional and Statutory Law* (Philadelphia, 1884).—By the editor of the *Digest*. Includes a treatise on public international law at §§ 115-251; very good on American relations.

*Henry Wheaton, *Elements of International Law* (Philadelphia and London, 1836; Lawrence's 2d ed., 1863; Boyd's 2d ed., 1880).—By an eminent diplomat and publicist. A standard work, enriched with valuable notes by the American and English editors.

Henry Wheaton, *History of the Law of Nations in Europe and America from the Earliest Times to 1842* (New York, 1845).—On the progress of international law from 1648 to 1843. A study of principles rather than events.

*Theodore D. Woolsey, *Introduction to the Study of International Law, designed as an aid in Teaching and in Historical Study* (1860; 6th ed., T. S. Woolsey, 1891).—A brief and very serviceable text-book with abundant references to American practice and elaborate bibliographical material.

D. Works on Special Topics.

Under this caption have been gathered the best monographs and special discussions on diplomatic topics. Many titles have been omitted because proceeding from writers without a large reputation, or because on rather minute fields, or because superseded by something better.

American Academy of Political and Social Science, *The Foreign Policy of the United States, Political and Commercial*. Addresses and Discussions at the Annual Meeting, April 7-8, 1899 (Philadelphia, 1899).

Charles C. Beaman, *The National and Private "Alabama Claims" and their "Final Amicable Settlement"* (Washington, 1871).

George Bemis, *American Neutrality, its Honorable Past; its Expedient Future* (Boston, 1886).

* Mountague Bernard, *An Historical Account of the Neutrality of Great Britain during the Civil War* (London, 1870).

J. D. Bullock, *Secret Service of the Confederate States in Europe* (New York, 1883).

* John Bigelow, *France and the Confederate Navy, 1862-1868; An International Episode* (London, 1888).—By a former minister to France.

Edward Bicknell, *The Territorial Acquisitions of the United States: An Historical Review* (Boston, 1899).

James Morton Callahan, *The Neutrality of the American Lakes, and Anglo-American Relations* (Baltimore, 1898). *Cuba and International Relations; An Historical Study in American Diplomacy* (Baltimore, 1899). *American Relations in the Pacific and the Far East, 1784-1900* (Baltimore, 1901). *The Diplomatic History of the Southern Confederacy* (Baltimore, 1901).—These ambitious volumes, appearing in rapid succession, are perhaps not studied with extreme care.

Edmund Janes Carpenter, *America in Hawaii; A History of United States Influence on the Hawaiian Islands* (Boston, 1899).

George Coggeshall, *History of the American Privateers* (New York, 1856).

Charles Arthur Conant, *The United States in the Orient: The Nature of the Economic Problem* (Boston, 1900).

Caleb Cushing, *The Treaty of Washington; Its Negotiation, Execution, and the Discussions Relating Thereto* (New York, 1873).

* William Edward Burghardt DuBois, *The Suppression of the African Slave-Trade to the United States of America, 1638-1870* (New York, 1896).

Albert Gallatin, *On the Northeastern Boundary in Connection with Mr. Jay's Map, with a Speech on the same Subject by Daniel Webster, delivered April 15, 1843* (New York, 1843).

James C. Fernald, *The Imperial Republic, with five Maps* (New York, 1898).

James Watson Gerard, *The Treaty of Utrecht: A Historical Review of the Great Treaty of 1714* (New York, 1888).

William Elliot Griffis, *America in the East: A Glance at our History, Prospects, Problems and Duties in the Pacific Ocean* (New York, 1899).

Binger Hermann, *The Louisiana Purchase, and our Title West of the Rocky Mountains, with a Review of Annexation by the United States* (Washington, 1898).

Frederick W. Holls, *The Peace Conference at the Hague and its Bearings on International Law and Policy* (New York, 1900).—A rather optimistic account of the Conference and its work.

Lindley Miller Keasbey, *The Nicaragua Canal and the Monroe Doctrine: A Political History of Isthmus Transit* (New York, 1896).—A book of which the central thought is that every American statesman who did not insist on the exclusive rights of the United States in the Isthmus, was false to his trust.

David Starr Jordan, *Imperial Democracy: A Study of the Relation of Government by the People, Equity before the Law and other Tenets of Democracy, to the Demands of a Vigorous Foreign Policy and other Demands of Imperial Democracy* (New York, 1899).

* Thomas Joseph Lawrence, *Essays on Some Disputed Questions in Modern International Law* (2d ed., Cambridge and London, 1888).—Includes several essays on the Monroe Doctrine and Canal diplomacy.

* Alfred Thayer Mahan, *Lessons of the War with Spain, and other Articles* (Boston, 1899). *The Problem of Asia and its Effect on International Policies* (Boston, 1900).—By one of the greatest authorities on foreign relations.

John Bassett Moore, *A Treatise on Extradition and Interstate Rendition*, 2 vols., (Boston, 1891).—Includes details of many incidents of diplomatic discussion.

* Paul S. Reinsch, *World Politics at the End of the Nineteenth Century as Influenced by the Oriental Situation* (New York, 1900).

* William Fidian Reddaway, *The Monroe Doctrine* (Cambridge, England, 1898).—Perhaps the best discussion of the contemporary conditions of the doctrine.

Raphael Semmes, *Service Afloat, or the Remarkable Career of the Confederate Cruisers "Sumter" and "Alabama"* (Baltimore, 1887).

Ira Dudley Travis, *The History of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty* (Ann Arbor, 1900).—A very thorough and sound discussion of a very important subject.

George Fox Tucker, *The Monroe Doctrine: A Concise History of its Origin and Growth* (Boston, 1885).

* Theodore S. Woolsey, *America's Foreign Policy: Essays and Addresses* (New York, 1898).

E. Periodicals containing Articles on American Diplomacy.

There is no American periodical devoted especially to international law, though there are several in which articles on international relations appear. For lists of publications and for classified references, see *Poole's Index* and Jones's *Index to Legal Periodical Literature*.—A few titles only are given, all in English.

American Academy of Political and Social Science, *Annals* (1890—).

—Some studies on foreign relations, but chiefly devoted to other work.

American Annual Cyclopaedia (40 vols. to 1900, New York, 1861—).

—A valuable series, with many documents.

* *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895—).—Many studies in diplomatic history.

The American Law Review (Boston, 1866—).

The Annual Register (143 vols. to 1900, London, 1759—).—A collection of materials and compilations annually published for nearly a century and a half; often very instructive.

Army and Navy Journal (New York, 1863—).

Association for the Review and Codification of the Law of Nations, *Reports of Annual Conferences*.

Forum (New York, 1886-).—Many discussions by public men.

Harper's Magazine (New York, 1850-).

* *The Nation* (70 vols. to 1900, New York, 1865-).—Editorial correspondence and reviews on many diplomatic questions.

National Geographic Magazine (Washington, 1888-).—Excellent accounts of boundary controversies.

Niles's Weekly Register (75 vols., Baltimore, 1812-1849).—An invaluable repository of current documents and discussions.

North American Review (170 vols. to 1900, Boston and New York, 1815-).—For sixty years abounding in the ablest discussions of public affairs.

Political Science Quarterly (New York, 1886-).—Many articles on foreign relations; and valuable chronological summaries of current events.

Statesman's Year Book (London, 1864-).—An annual survey of the political and statistical situation of the world.

* *The Times* (London). The great English daily; has pages devoted to foreign news from all over the world. Can be exploited by means of a special annual summary.

The Yale Review (New Haven, 1896-).—Discussions of colonization and occasionally of diplomatic questions.

The following foreign international law periodicals from time to time print discussions on American international questions.

Bulletin de la Société de Législation Comparée (Paris, 1872-).

* *Revue Générale de Droit International Public* (Paris, 1894-).

Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique (Paris, 1887-).

Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée, 32 vols. to 1900 (Paris, 1869-).

IV. SOURCES.

The abundant sources of American diplomatic history have as yet been too little explored: for convenience they may be classified into collections of treaties and documents; official correspondence; and private biography, memoirs and correspondence.

A. Treaties.

On the pre-constitutional treaties affecting American affairs, see a synoptical list in Woolsey's *International Law*, 6th ed., pp. 406-408, with a list of the collections of treaties. The following titles are especially serviceable for the diplomacy of the colonial period.

George Chalmers, *A Collection of Treatys between Great Britain and Other Powers*, 2 vols., (London, 1790).

Jean Dumont, *Corps Universel Diplomatique du Droit des Gens, contenant un Recueil des Traités, Capitulations Impériales et Royales*, etc., 8 vols., (1726-1731).—Contains documents from 800 A. D. to 1730. Many pieces besides treaties are included. All the texts except the Latin are translated into French. An alphabetical index to the whole at the end of Volume III., supplement.

**A General Collection of Treaties, Declarations of War, Pamphlets and other Publications, relating to Peace and War*, 4 vols., 2d ed. (London, 1732).—This collection includes materials from 1495 to 1731 and is extremely serviceable.

Thomas Rymer, *Foedera, Conventiones, Literae et cujuscumque generis Acta Publica*, 2d ed., 20 vols., (London, 1728–1735).—Comes down from 1101 to 1654. Many titles in English. A *Syllabus* in English by T. D. Hardy has been published, 3 vols., (London, 1869–1883).

*Tétot, *Répertoire de Traités de Paix* (Paris, 1866).—Practically an index to Dumont and the other great collections covering the period from 1493 to 1866.

The treaties of the federal period (1778–1901) are regularly printed with the annual statutes of the United States, and also in two official collections:

United States, *Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, Post Office, Public Treaties* (Washington, 1875).

United States, *Treaties and Conventions concluded between the United States and other Powers since July 4, 1776* (Washington, 1889); also printed as *Senate Executive Documents*, 48 Cong., 2 sess., No. 47.

United States, *Compilation of Treaties in Force* (Washington, 1899).

Treaties between other American powers, or between American powers and European powers, or between European powers on American subjects, since the American Revolution, will be found in the standard collections of state papers, such as *British and Foreign State Papers*, *Archives Diplomatiques*, *Staatsarchiv*; and also in the following collections (see Tétot, *Répertoire des Traités*).

*Carlos Calvo, *Coleccion Completa de los Tratados, Convenciones, Capitulaciones, Armisticios y otros Actos diplomáticos de todos los Estados de la América Latina . . . desde 1493*, 11 vols., (Paris, 1862–1869).—Comes down to 1823; includes also Spanish and Portuguese treaties in the colonial period.

Martens and Cussy, *Recueil Manuel et Pratique de Traités, Conventions et autres Actes Diplomatiques*, 7 vols., (Leipzig, 1846–1857). Gives significant parts of treaties or refers to their source. Covers the period 1760–1856.—An abridgment of the great Martens, *Recueil*, etc. The latter continues Dumont and Wenck, and is continued by:

Charles Samwer and Jules Hopf, *Nouveau Recueil Général de Traités et autres Ordres Relatifs aux Rapports de Droit International*, 25 vols. and index, to 1900 (Göttingen, 1876–).—Treaties and other documents in original language or French.

B. Official Collections of Documents.

Indexes and finding lists of public documents are enumerated in Channing and Hart, *Guide to the Study of American History*, § 16e. In T. H. McKee's *Reports of the Select Special Committees, United States Senate*, and *Reports of the Select and Special Committees, United States House of*

Representatives (both Washington, 1887), are lists of printed reports made by Committees on Foreign Relations from 1815 to 1887. A careful list of indexes and other aids in United States government publications will be found in *American Statistical Association Publications*, Vol. VII. (1900). Some account of the publications of the State Department appears in Schuyler, *American Diplomacy*, pp. 132-133.

A few despatches and treaties, or extracts from despatches and treaties, are reprinted in the special collections made for the use of schools and colleges. Thus in Hart and Channing, *American History Leaflets*, appear correspondence on Cuba (No. 2); Monroe Doctrine (No. 4); Bering Sea Controversy (No. 6); Colonial Wars (Nos. 7, 14); Navigation Acts (No. 19); Isthmus Canal (No. 34). William MacDonald, in his *Select Charters and Select Documents*, prints a few treaties.

There are three indispensable official collections:

* Francis Wharton, *Digest of the International Law of the United States, taken from Documents issued by Presidents and Secretaries of State, and from Decisions of Federal Courts and Opinions of Attorneys-General*, 3 vols., (Washington, 1886; 2d ed., no alteration of plates, 1887).—This series gives quotations, often several pages in extent, from printed (and occasionally unprinted) materials in the State Department, arranged under classified headings; it is of the utmost service to the student of American diplomacy. A new edition is promised under the efficient editorship of John Bassett Moore.

* John Bassett Moore, *History and Digest of the International Arbitrations to which the United States has been a Party, together with Appendices containing the Treaties relating to such Arbitrations, and Historical and Legal Notes on other International Arbitrations, Ancient and Modern, and on the Domestic Commissions of the United States for the Adjustment of International Claims*, 6 vols., (Washington, 1898).—Although by its title limited to a discussion of questions which have involved some form of international arbitration, as a matter of fact nearly all the great controversies between the United States and other powers are here set forth in authentic narrative, fortified with abundant citations. Hundreds of cases are summarized, hundreds of others are referred to. The book is the largest single contribution ever made to the knowledge of American foreign affairs.

* James D. Richardson, compiler, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897*, 10 vols., (Washington, 1896-1899).—This set contains the annual and occasional messages of the presidents, including a vast amount of material on foreign affairs. It is expected to be ultimately obtainable from the Government at cost.

C. Cases in International Law.

One of the principal sources of international law is the adjudications of courts, which often decide diplomatic controversies, or contain historical summaries of international relations. In the United States both state and federal courts make decisions based on international law; but

the decisions of the Circuit Courts, and of the Supreme Court of the United States are most likely to deal with public law; and they alone can finally construe federal treaties or statutes, if their validity is contested. Cases may be traced through the ordinary digests, and also through footnotes to treatises on international law. Spécial lists of cases, English and American, may be found in T. J. Walker, *Science of International Law*, pp. xiii-xv; J. B. Moore, *History and Digest of International Arbitrations*, I. lxiii-lxxii.

The texts of the Federal decisions are to be found in four series of collected cases as follows:

Federal Cases, comprising Cases argued and determined in the Circuit and District Courts of the U. S. from the Colonial Times to the Beginning of the Federal Reporter, 30 vols. and *Digest* (St. Paul, 1894-1898).—Over 18,000 cases arranged alphabetically by cases, from 1789 to 1880.

Federal Reporter; Cases argued and determined in the Circuit and District Courts of the United States, 104 vols. and three *Digests*, to 1901 (St. Paul, 1880-).

* *United States Reports, Supreme Court*, 173 vols. to 1898.—Till 1882 published under the names of the official collectors or reporters of cases as follows:

Dallas [1789-1800], 4 vols., (Philadelphia, 1790-1808); Cranch [1801-1805], 9 vols., (Washington, 1804-1817); Wheaton [1816-1827], 12 vols., (New York, 1816-1827); Peters [1828-1843], 17 vols., (Philadelphia, 1828-1843); Howard [1843-1860], 24 vols., (Philadelphia, 1843-1860); Black [1861-1862], 2 vols., (Washington, 1862-1863); Wallace [1863-1874], 23 vols., (Washington, 1876-1883); Otto [1875-1882], 17 vols., (Washington, 1882); also bears the title *United States Reports, Vols. 91-107; United States Reports* [1882-].

Since 1882 a parallel edition has been published in an annual volume (at first two volumes a year) under the title:

Supreme Court Reports, Cases argued and determined in the United States Supreme Court, 21 vols. to 1900 (St. Paul, 1883-).

Particular questions in international law, and the historical accounts of episodes included in the judges' opinions, may be found through the various digests of cases, and especially through:

Rose, *Notes on the United States Reports: A Brief Chronological Digest of all Points Determined in the Decisions of the Supreme Court, with Notes showing the influence, following, and present authority of each case as disclosed by the citations*, 12 vols., (San Francisco, 1899-1901).—Sums up the later attitude of the courts on each decision and the principles involved down to 1898.

Without authority as decisions in contested cases, the official opinions drawn up for the guidance of the President or heads of departments, are of much weight as historical documents and as the conclusions of trained lawyers, beginning in 1791:

Official Opinions of the Attorney General of the United States (24 vols. to 1900, Washington, 1852-).

Of the four following collections of select cases, the first two are general, but include some of the most important cases defining the foreign powers of the United States government. The last two are special, and are important aids to the study of American diplomacy.

James Bradley Thayer, *Cases in Constitutional Law, with Notes*, 2 vols., (Cambridge, 1894-1895).—A most admirable selection, by a great constitutional lawyer.

Carl Evans Boyd, *Cases on American Constitutional Law* (Chicago, 1898).—Practically a selection from Thayer's *Cases*.

*Freeman Snow, *Cases and Opinions in International Law, with Notes and a Syllabus* (Boston, 1893).—Notes very few; syllabus at pp. xiii-xl.; cases convenient and to the point.

Pitt Cobbett, *Leading Cases and Opinions in International Law collected and digested from English and Foreign Reports, and Other Sources. With Notes and Excursus, containing the Views of the Text Writers referred to, with Supplementary Cases, Treaties and Statutes* (London, 1862).

D. American Official Correspondence.

The United States government has published seven different series of diplomatic correspondence. Upon the character and history of these collections see Justin Winsor, *Reader's Handbook of the American Revolution* (Boston, 1880), and *Narrative and Critical History of America*, VII. 294; VIII. 414.

1. Jared Sparks, editor, *The Diplomatic Correspondence of the American Revolution*, 12 vols., (Boston, 1829-1830, 2d ed. in 6 vols., Washington, 1857).—This series includes despatches to and from our foreign representatives from 1776 to 1783; and also the correspondence of the French ministers with Congress.

2. Francis Wharton, editor, *The Revolutionary Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States*, 6 vols., (Washington, 1889).—This contains substantially the material of the Sparks edition, with many additions; and is arranged chronologically.

3. *The Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States of America from the Signing of the Definitive Treaty of Peace, 10th September, 1783, to the Adoption of the Constitution, March 4, 1789*, 7 vols., (Washington, 1833-1834; reprinted in 3 vols., 1837).—This correspondence is arranged on about the plan of Sparks's *Correspondence*.

4. Thomas B. Wait, editor, *State Papers and Public Documents of the United States, being a Complete View of our Foreign Relations*, 12 vols., (Boston, 1817-1819).—This series extends from 1789 to 1818, and is practically superseded by the *American State Papers, Foreign*.

5. Walter Lowrie and Matthew St. Clair Clarke, editors, *American State Papers; Documents, Legislative and Executive, of the Congress of the United States. Class I. Foreign Relations*, 6 vols., (Washington, 1832-1859).—This series is a reprint of correspondence submitted at various

times to Congress.—It is extremely well arranged and indexed, and covers the period from 1789 to 1828.

6. Between 1828 and 1860 there was no systematic collection and the very important diplomatic correspondence is scattered through the executive documents. The President in many special messages refers to particular correspondence which may be traced through Richardson's *Messages of the Presidents*. The main official collections during this period are the following :

- 1835 : House Doc., 24 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. I., No. 2.
- 1836 : Senate Doc., 24 Cong., 2 sess., Vol. I., No. 1.
- 1837 : Senate Doc., 25 Cong., 2 sess., Vol. I., No. 1 ; House Doc., 25 Cong., 2 sess., Vol. I., No. 3.
- 1838 : Senate Doc., 25 Cong., 3 sess., Vol. I., No. 2 ; House Doc., 25 Cong., 3 sess., Vol. I., No. 2.
- 1839 : None.
- 1840 : None.
- 1841 : Senate Doc., 27 Cong., 2 sess., Vol. I., No. 1 ; House Doc., 27 Cong., 2 sess., Vol. I., No. 2.
- 1842 : Senate Doc., 27 Cong., 3 sess., Vol. I., No. 1 ; House Doc., 27 Cong., 3 sess., Vol. I., No. 2.
- 1843 : Senate Doc., 28 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. I., No. 1 ; House Doc., 28 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. I., No. 1.
- 1844 : Senate Doc., 28 Cong., 2 sess., Vol. I., No. 1 ; House Doc., 28 Cong., 2 sess., Vol. I., No. 2.
- 1845 : Senate Doc., 29 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. I., No. 1 : House Doc., 29 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. I., No. 2.
- 1846 : Senate Doc., 29 Cong., 2 sess., Vol. I., No. 1 ; House Doc., 29 Cong., 2 sess., Vol. I., No. 4.
- 1847 : Senate Doc., 30 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. I., No. 1.
- 1848 : House Ex., 30 Cong., 2 sess., Vol. I., No. 1, pt. 1.
- 1849 : House Ex., 31 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. III., pt. 1, No. 5, pt. 1.
- 1850 : None.
- 1851 : Senate Ex., 32 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. I., No. 1, pt. 1 ; House Ex., 32 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. II., pt. 1, No. 2, pt. 1.
- 1852 : None.
- 1853 : Senate Ex., 33 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. I., No. 1, pt. 1 ; House Ex., 33 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. I., pt. 1, No. 1, pt. 1.
- 1854 : Senate Ex., 2 sess., Vol. I., No. 1, pt. 1 ; House Ex., 33 Cong., 2 sess., Vol. I., No. 1, pt. 1.
- 1855 : Senate Ex., 34 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. I., No. 1, pt. 1 ; House Ex., 34 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. I., pt. 1, No. 1, pt. 1.
- 1856 : Senate Ex., 34 Cong., 3 sess., Vol. II., No. 5, pt. 1 ; House Ex., 34 Cong., 3 sess., Vol. I., pt. 1, No. 1, pt. 1.
- 1857 : Senate Ex., 35 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. II., No. 2, pt. 1 ; House Ex., 35 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. II., pt. 1, No. 2, pt. 1.
- 1858 : Senate Ex., 35 Cong., 2 sess., Vol. I., No. 1, pt. 2 ; House Ex., 35 Cong., 2 sess., Vol. II., pt. 1, No. 2, pt. 1.

1859: Senate Ex., 36 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. I., No. 2, pt. 1.

1860: None.

7. *Papers relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States* (Washington, 1861).—Beginning with 1861, an annual volume or volumes containing important extracts from diplomatic correspondence of the preceding twelve months has been sent to Congress with the President's annual message. This series is the standard collection for all diplomatic affairs since 1861. One volume has appeared in each year, except as follows: 1863, two volumes; 1864, four volumes; 1865, four volumes; 1866, three volumes; 1867, two volumes; 1868, two volumes; 1869, none published; 1872, six volumes; 1873, three volumes; 1875, two volumes; 1888, two volumes; 1894, three volumes; 1895, two volumes.

There should also be mentioned the following series: *United States Consular Reports* (Washington, 1880—).—Since 1880 the State Department has published a series of reports from foreign consuls on a great variety of subjects, chiefly commercial. They of course contain little or no material on diplomatic relations. A list of these reports to 1890 is printed in John G. Ames, *Finding List*, at p. 100.

E. Foreign Official Correspondence.

On the colonial period the only available and useful collections are:

Calendar of State Papers, Colonial, America and West Indies, 7 vols., (London, 1860—).—This series, still in progress, has now reached the year 1689. It states the substance of papers and prints some extracts. It is of the greatest service in the study of diplomacy relating to the colonies.

E. B. O'Callaghan and Berthold Fernow, editors, *Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, 15 vols., (Albany, 1856–1887).—Contains many pieces on the relations of the French and English colonies.

On the federal period there are three series of foreign annual publications of state papers, intended primarily for the use of diplomats and consuls of the respective countries.

Archives Diplomatiques, Recueil de Diplomatie et d'Histoire, 70 vols. to 1899 (Paris, 1861—).—All in French or translated into French. Many treaties and other documents of periods before 1861, some as far back as A.D. 1400.

* *British and Foreign State Papers, compiled by the Librarian and Keeper of the Papers, Foreign Office* (90 vols. to 1900, London, 1812—).—Contains treaties, constitutions and documents chiefly in English.

Das Staatsarchiv: Sammlung der Officiellen Actenstücke zur Geschichte der Gegenwart, 43 vols. to 1898 (Hamburg, 1861—).—In English, French or German, as the case may be.

The diplomatic correspondence of foreign countries is usually

published in collections made up when negotiations have been completed. For the diplomatic history of the United States by far the most important of such series is the "Blue Books," issued from time to time by the English government. These are included in the annual "parliamentary papers;" and particular correspondence is easily reached through the single index to the whole series of papers issued in any one year.

F. American Private Correspondence and Memoirs.

The literature of American history is very rich in biographies containing correspondence and in the collected works of statesmen; but deficient in diaries and autobiographies of diplomats. The first two of these categories are set forth in Channing and Hart, *Guide*, § 25 (biographies), § 32 (works of American statesmen). The most important contributions in this sort to the history of American diplomacy are the lives and works of: John Adams, John Quincy Adams, Joel Barlow, James G. Blaine, James Buchanan, John C. Calhoun, Lewis Cass, Henry Clay, Thomas Corwin, Alexander J. Dallas, Silas Deane, Daniel S. Dickinson, Edward Everett, Hamilton Fish, John Forsyth, Benjamin Franklin, Albert Gallatin, Elbridge Gerry, Alexander Hamilton, Sam Houston, Thomas Hutchinson, Ralph Izard, John Jay, Thomas Jefferson, Abbott Lawrence, Francis Lieber, Edward Livingston, William Lee, Abraham Lincoln, James Madison, William L. Marcy, George P. Marsh, John Marshall, James Monroe, Gouverneur Morris, John L. Motley, William Penn, Timothy Pickering, Joel R. Poinsett, James K. Polk, Edmund Randolph, John Randolph, William H. Seward, Jared Sparks, Charles Sumner, John Tyler, Martin Van Buren, George Washington, Daniel Webster, Francis Wharton.

There is a diary of James K. Polk still in manuscript; but almost the only printed diaries or autobiographies which are of service are the following:

John Quincy Adams, *Memoirs, comprising Parts of his Diary from 1795 to 1848*, 12 vols., (Philadelphia, 1874-1877).—An invaluable record on most of the diplomatic questions from 1809 to 1845.

James Monroe, *View of the Conduct of the Executive in Foreign Affairs, 1794-1796* (Philadelphia, 1797).

John G. Nicolay and John Hay, *Abraham Lincoln, a History*, 10 vols., (New York, 1890).—Contains so many extracts from narratives of diplomatic events as to deserve special mention.

Richard Rush, *Memoranda of a Residence at the Court of London, 1817-1825* (Philadelphia, 1833). Second series, 2 vols., (Philadelphia, 1845).—Chiefly on the Monroe Doctrine.

Waddy Thompson, *Recollections of Mexico* (New York, 1846).—On his experiences as U. S. Minister.

G. Foreign Private Correspondence and Memoirs.

The only French diplomats who published their experiences in America, except in the official collections, were:

Hyde de Neuville, *Mémoires et Souvenirs*, 3 vols., (Paris, 1888-1893), and

Adolphe de Bacourt, *Souvenirs d'un Diplomate : Lettres Intimes sur l'Amérique* (Paris, 1882).

The English memoirs and biographies containing correspondence are very numerous ; some of them are mentioned in T. J. Walker, *Science of International Law*, pp. vii-xvi. A few which have especial significance for American relations are :

E. P. Brenton, *Life and Correspondence of John, Earl of St. Vincent*.—On the first stage of the Napoleonic Wars.

Sir H. L. Bulwer and E. Ashley, *Life of Lord Palmerston*, 4 vols., (London, 1874-1876).

Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, *Life of Shelburne*, 3 vols., (London, 1875-1876).

G. H. Francis, *Opinions and Policy of Lord Palmerston* (London, 1852).

W. Bodham Donne, editor, *Correspondence of George the Third with Lord North, 1768 to 1783* (London, 1867).—Very important for the negotiations of 1782.

Captain Basil Hall, *Fragments of Voyages and Travels, Including Anecdotes of a Naval Life* (Philadelphia, 1831).—On captures of neutral vessels.

James Harris, Earl of Malmesbury, *Diaries and Correspondence, containing an Account of his Missions* (London, 1845).

James Howard Harris, Earl of Malmesbury, *Memoirs of an Ex-Minister, an Autobiography, 1814-1852* (London, 1884).

Lady Jackson, editor, *Sir George Jackson : The Bath Archives ; A Further Selection from Diaries and Letters from 1809 to 1816* (London, 1873).—On F. J. Jackson's mission to the United States, in 1809.

John, Earl Russell, editor, *Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox*, 4 vols., (London, 1853-1857).

John, Earl Russell, *Recollections and Suggestions, 1813-1873* (London, 1875).

Philip Henry, Earl Stanhope, *Life of the Rt. Hon. William Pitt*, 4 vols., (London, 1861-1862).

E. J. Stapleton, editor, *Some Official Correspondence of George Canning, 1770-1827*, 2 vols., (London, 1887).—Essential on the Monroe Doctrine.

Spencer Walpole, *The Life of Lord John Russell*, 2 vols., (London, 1889).

R. R. Pearce, *Memoirs and Correspondence of Richard, Marquess Wellesley*, 3 vols., (London, 1846).

H. Manuscript Archives.

The manuscript official files of the government, including instructions, despatches to and from ministers and consuls, claims against foreign

governments, reports on boundaries, records of commissions, etc., are stored in the archives of the State Department in Washington, where are also many of the public and private papers of Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and some other American statesmen. The use of these archives must of course be very carefully guarded, and none but persons properly accredited are admitted; and even from them materials which would affect pending negotiations or rouse international ill-feeling are carefully withdrawn. See Schuyler, *American Diplomacy*, pp. 38-40; Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History*, VIII.

Foreign manuscript collections relative to American history and relations are described at much length in Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History*, VIII. 459-468.

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.

NOTE.—It should have been mentioned on p. 766, above, that the French text of the document there printed will appear next autumn in the *Life of Jules Simon*, now being published by his sons, to whom we are indebted for permission to print this translation.

NOTES AND NEWS

As heretofore announced, Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, of the University of Michigan, will hereafter be the managing editor of this journal. He may be addressed at 836 Tappan Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

The Right Reverend Dr. William Stubbs, bishop of Oxford and chancellor of the Order of the Garter, who by universal consent was deemed the most eminent of living English historians, died on April 22. He was born on June 21, 1825, at Knaresborough, and was wont sportively to attribute much of his interest in constitutional antiquities to the fact that he was born in an ancient forest-jurisdiction. He took high honors at Christ Church in 1848, became a fellow of Trinity, and in 1850 vicar of Navestock. The first edition of his *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum* was issued in 1858. In 1862 he was made librarian to the archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth. There he began that series of contributions to the Rolls Series which, down to the publication of the *Constitutional History*, constituted his chief title to eminence—the *Chronicles and Memorials of Richard I.*, “Benedict of Peterborough,” Roger Hoveden, Walter of Coventry, the *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, Ralph de Diceto, Gervase of Canterbury, *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I. and II.*, and the *Gesta Regum* and *Historia Novella* of William of Malmesbury,—editions which, issued during the years from 1864 to 1889, were marked by the highest scholarship, and the introductions to which contributed immeasurably to sound knowledge of the English Middle Ages. In 1866 Dr. Stubbs became regius professor of modern history at the University of Oxford. That as professor he sensibly affected the minds of the rank and file of undergraduates cannot be affirmed; and how he chafed under the statutory requirement of public lectures he made amusingly manifest in various passages of his *Seventeen Lectures*. Yet he exerted a strong influence on English superior instruction in history. The direction in which he sought to do this was shown by the publication in 1870 of his *Select Charters and other Illustrations of English Constitutional History*. That book has introduced hundreds of young students to the study of English medieval documents. The introductions interspersed by the compiler formed a preliminary sketch for his great work on the *Constitutional History of England in its Origin and Development*, of which the first edition appeared in 1874, 1875 and 1878, and the sixth a year or two ago. It would be superfluous now to praise this well-known and masterly treatise, marked equally by learning, sense of proportion, soundness of judgment and

power of thought. In 1884 Dr. Stubbs became bishop of Chester, whence in 1889 he was translated to Oxford. The episcopal office made further historical writing impossible for him, as for the late bishop of London. Yet he gave great attention to the revision of the successive editions of his *Constitutional History*, and he found time to render much aid to the Historical Manuscripts Commission, of whose productions he assured the present writer that he always read the proof-sheets. Indeed under the rubric "Favorite Recreations" in the English *Who's Who* (a rubric characteristically and rightly absent from the American book of the same name) the Bishop of Oxford had the note, "making out pedigrees and correcting proof-sheets." In ecclesiastical matters Dr. Stubbs was an old-fashioned High Churchman, an active and conscientious prelate, but gifted with a sense of humor. In private he was a kindly and witty gentleman, the friend and aider of all serious historical students.

Professor Bernhard Erdmannsdörffer of Heidelberg died on March first, aged 68. He was a distinguished teacher, particularly in the fields of modern history and had held a professorship at Heidelberg since 1874. His first publications were two seventeenth-century biographies, of Charles Emanuel I. of Savoy and of Georg Friedrich of Waldeck, printed in 1862 and 1869. At Berlin he had an important part in the editing of the documents of the Great Elector. At Heidelberg, after the establishment of the Baden Historical Commission, he edited some of the earlier volumes of the political correspondence of the Margrave Karl Friedrich. But his chief narrative historical work was his *Deutsche Geschichte vom westphälischen Frieden bis zum Regierungsantritt Friedrichs des Grossen* (1892-1893) in the Oncken series. Former pupils of Erdmannsdörffer, of whom there are not a few in America, may be glad to have their attention called to the article by Gothein in the April number of the *Preussische Jahrbücher*.

Dr. Karl Biedermann died on March 6, aged eighty-nine. He had an active part in Saxon and German politics in the revolutionary years 1847-1848, and was a member of the Frankfort Parliament of the latter year. His first important historical work, and a very interesting one, was his *Deutschlands Politische, Materielle und Sociale Zustände im achtzehnten Jahrhundert* (1854-1867). This was followed (1870-1882) by his *Dreissig Jahre deutscher Geschichte*, relating to the stirring years 1840-1870. This reached a fourth edition in 1896, and was supplemented by, and finally combined with, a historical account of the twenty-five years preceding, 1815-1840. Another work of high popularity was his *Deutsche Volks- und Kulturgeschichte* (1885, third ed. 1898). Dr. Biedermann, who retained to the last an honorary professorship at Leipzig, also wrote an entertaining autobiography entitled *Mein Leben und ein Stück Geschichte* (1886).

Rev. Dr. William Bright, canon of Christ Church, who since 1868 had been professor of ecclesiastical history in the University of Oxford, and whose *Chapters in Early English Church History* was highly esteemed, died on March 6, aged seventy-six.

William H. Egle, M.D., editor of many volumes of the *Pennsylvania Archives*, second and third series, and author of a history of Pennsylvania and histories of Dauphin and Lebanon counties, died at Harrisburg, February 19, aged seventy.

Professor Max Farrand of Wesleyan University has been appointed head of the department of history at Leland Stanford University. His place at Middletown is to be taken by Dr. Dutcher of Cornell University.

Dr. Theodore Clarke Smith becomes assistant professor of American history in the Ohio State University.

Professor Henry Ferguson, of Trinity College, has leave of absence for the academic year 1901-1902.

The plan for the historical congress to be held in Rome in April, 1902, involves the maintenance of three sections. One will be occupied with general questions, questions of method and theory, the auxiliary sciences, economic history and the relations of history to sociology; one with ancient history; one with medieval and modern history. A review of historical progress in the nineteenth century will be attempted.

Messrs. Lea Brothers and Co. are about to bring out, under the editorship of Professor J. H. Wright of Harvard University, a translation of the *Allgemeine Geschichte* prepared some years ago by Flathe, Justi, Pflugk-Harttung, Philippson and others. The translation will include a continuation from 1870 to 1900 by Professor Charles M. Andrews of Bryn Mawr and three volumes of American history by Mr. John Fiske, and will be published in twenty-four volumes.

The Oxford University Press announces a small book (pp. 296) on *The Relations of Geography and History*, by Mr. Hereford B. George.

A revised and enlarged translation of Professor G. Sergi's *The Mediterranean Race: A Study of the Origin of European Peoples* has been published as a volume in Mr. Havelock Ellis's "Contemporary Science Series" (London, Walter Scott).

Among the recent books of an educational nature is *Liberty Documents*, with contemporary exposition and critical comment drawn from various writers, the whole selected and prepared by Miss Mabel Hill of the Lowell (Mass.) State Normal School, and edited with an introduction by Dr. Albert Bushnell Hart of Harvard University.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

A History of Babylonia and Assyria, by Dr. Robert W. Rogers (New York, Eaton and Mains) contains, beside the historical information suggested by the title, an account of recent explorations and excavations in the regions named, and an extensive dissertation on the sources at the historian's disposal.

An authorized translation of Dr. G. Adolf Deissmann's *Bible Studies*, by Alexander Grieve, is announced (New York, Scribners).

Almost all the passages to be found in classical literature bearing directly upon the subject of education and school life are brought together and connected by brief discussions and interpretations in a *Source-Book in the History of Education for the Greek and Roman Period*, by Dr. Paul Monroe, Professor of the History of Education in the Teachers College of Columbia University.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: V. Bérard, *L'Étude des Origines Grecques*, I. (Revue Historique, May); J. L. Strachan-Davidson, *Mommsen's Roman Criminal Law* (English Historical Review, April); Dom Chamard, *Les Origines du Symbole des Apôtres* (Revue des Questions Historiques, April); P. Allard, *L'Expédition de Julien contre Constance* (Revue des Questions Historiques, April); T. Mommsen, *Das theodosische Gesetzbuch* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung, Roman. Abt., XXI.).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

Mr. Henry C. Lea's *History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages* is to appear in a German translation by Professor Joseph Hansen, director of archives at Cologne.

The sixth and concluding volume of Mr. W. M. Flinders Petrie's *History of Egypt* is published by the Messrs. Scribner under the title, *A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages*, by Dr. Stanley Lane-Poole.

Messrs. Rivington have issued Volume III. of their "Periods of European History," entitled *The Close of the Middle Ages, A. D. 1273-1494*, by Professor R. Lodge, of the University of Edinburgh (New York, Macmillan).

MODERN HISTORY.

The Lane lectures delivered by Sir Michael Foster, M.P., at the Cooper Medical College in San Francisco, are to be published by the Cambridge University Press as *Lectures on the History of Physiology during the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries*.

In a privately printed pamphlet on *Smeerenburg*, Spitsbergen, Sir Martin Conway relates the history of this seventeenth-century settlement, and discusses the legends that have gathered about the story of its rise and fall.

Mr. J. Taylor Hamilton has written *A History of the Church known as the Moravian Church*, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Bethlehem, Pa., Times Publishing Co.).

The Fleming H. Revell Co. will shortly publish *The Convulsion in China at the End of the Century*, by Dr. Arthur H. Smith, whose previous books on China have been so highly regarded.

A Chronological Index of the Chief Events in the Foreign Intercourse of Korea is the title of a pamphlet compiled by Dr. Horace N. Allen, the

American envoy in Korea. The book contains lists of Korean treaties and agreements, and also of officials in the diplomatic and civil service.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Considerations of health have moved Dr. Samuel Rawson Gardiner to resign the charge of the *English Historical Review* into the able hands of Dr. Reginald Lane Poole, to whose service as assistant editor under Dr. Creighton and Dr. Gardiner that journal has owed so much. The April number, in which this announcement is made, contains an appreciative article by Dr. Richard Garnett of the British Museum on the late bishop of London, who edited the *Review* from its origin in 1886 until his consecration as bishop of Peterborough in 1891.

The British Government has published *List of Early Chancery Proceedings preserved in the Public Record Office*, Vol. I.; *Acts of the Privy Council of England* (New Series) Vol. XXIII., 1592; *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic*, Henry VIII., 1543, Part I.; *List of Proceedings in the Court of Star Chamber*, Vol. I., 1485-1558; and a report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission on the manuscripts of Mrs. Frankland-Russell-Astley, of Chequers Court, Bucks.

The Selden Society's annual report calls attention to its publication of Vol. XIV., *Beverly Town Records*, in November, 1900. Vol. XIII., *Select Pleas of the Forests*, by Mr. S. J. Turner, is still in arrear. Vol. XV., the first volume of *Select Proceedings in the Star Chamber*, may be expected to appear during the summer of 1901.

The library and offices of the Royal Historical Society have been transferred from St. Martin's Lane to No. 3 Old Serjeants' Inn, Chancery Lane, where the meetings of the council will henceforward be held.

The Catalogue of the Rawlinson Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library has been completed by the addition of two more volumes of entries and one of index. Of special collections, those of Thomas Hearne, Sir Thomas Browne, and the Rawlinson family are most extensive. There are a large number of Italian historical tracts, and instructions to papal ambassadors in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Papers relating to America are numerous. The manuscript of John Dunton's American narrative (1685-1686) first printed in 1867 by the Prince Society, is one of these. There are letters from George Fox and other Quakers, papers relating to the affairs of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and also to various epochs of the colonial administration in New York.

Messrs. Macmillan announce the first volume of *Early English Printed Books in the University Library, Cambridge, 1475-1640*, covering the issues from Caxton to F. Kingston.

Professor Earle's essay on *The Alfred Jewel*, with illustrations and map, is on the point of publication, or already published, by the Oxford University Press.

The Writings of King Alfred, Mr. Frederic Harrison's Harvard lecture, is issued by the Macmillan Co.

Nos. 112 and 113 of the *Old South Leaflets* are, respectively, "King Alfred's Description of Europe," taken from his translation of Orosius, and "Augustine in England," from King Alfred's version of Bede.

Mr. William A. Slade of the Library of Congress has in preparation a bibliography of Alfred the Great, aiming at completeness, which may be expected to be finished in time for the millennial celebration of the death of King Alfred, now deferred till October.

Messrs. Sands and Co. will publish shortly *The History of Mary the First, Queen of England*, by Mr. J. M. Stone, a work based on a careful study of state papers, ambassadors' despatches and other contemporary documents of that time, and elaborately illustrated.

Messrs. Archibald Constable and Co. announce a volume of hitherto unpublished *Autograph Poems of James the First of England and Sixth of Scotland*, which have been recently discovered in the Bodleian Library. The volume will be edited by Mr. Robert S. Rait, of New College, Oxford.

A new edition of the speeches of Cromwell, collected and edited by Charles L. Stainer, M.A. Christ Church, is announced by the Clarendon Press.

Messrs. Goupil and Co. announce *Charles II.* by Dr. Osmund Airy, in an edition uniform with their *Mary Stuart, Charles I.*, etc.

Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. announce *Cavalier and Puritan in the Days of the Stuarts*, compiled from the private papers and diary of Sir Richard Newdigate, and from manuscript newsletters addressed to him between 1675 and 1689. The volume will be edited by Miss Anne Emily Newdigate-Newdegate.

The Rifle Brigade, by Mr. Walter Wood (London, Grant Richards), forms the first volume of the series "British Regiments in War and Peace" which Mr. Wood has undertaken to write in order to supply a gap in the published records of the regiments forming the British army. The Rifle Corps was officially gazetted in October, 1800, has fought in many important engagements in both hemispheres, and has lately seen severe service in South Africa. The second book of the series, *The Northumberland Fusileers* (London, Grant Richards), will furnish a record of one of the oldest and most illustrious regiments in the British army.

Longmans, Green and Co. have just brought out *Bolingbroke and His Times*, by Walter Sichel, being an historical study of the times of Queen Anne.

Messrs. L. C. Page and Co. have reprinted in full the edition of 1832 of *The Secret History of the Court of England, from the Accession of George III. to the Death of George IV.*, by Lady Anne Hamilton.

The Life and Letters of Zachary Macaulay, by his granddaughter, Viscountess Knutsford (London, Edward Arnold), is of interest, not only as a biography of the father of Lord Macaulay, but as the record of the life of one of the most earnest and disinterested of England's early humanitarian reformers, especially prominent in the anti-slavery movement.

The latest volume in the series "Builders of Greater Britain" (Longmans), is *Sir Stamford Raffles*, by Mr. Hugh Edward Egerton, for which abundant material, additional to that presented in the memoir published in 1830, has been obtained at the India Office.

Some Records of the Later Life of Harriet, Countess Granville, by her granddaughter, Susan H. Oldfield (Longmans), forms a supplementary volume to those letters of Countess Granville written during her married life, and published in 1894.

The York Prize Essay for 1900, by Mr. J. E. R. de Villiers, is published (Cambridge University Press) under the title *The History of the Legislation concerning Real and Personal Property in England during the Reign of Queen Victoria*.

Shifting Scenes; or Memories of Many Men in Many Lands, by the Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Malet (London, Murray), is a series of reminiscences of persons and events throughout an eventful diplomatic career. The author was at Washington during the Civil War, in Constantinople from 1865 to 1867, in Paris while the Franco-Prussian war was in progress, and in Egypt during the years which immediately preceded the British occupation.

Messrs. Longmans and Co. will shortly publish *Letters and Journals of the China War, 1860*, by Major-General G. Allgoods. As a lieutenant the author served with the First Division China Field Force.

Egypt and the Hinterland, by Mr. Frederick W. Fuller (Longmans, Green and Co.), contains a brief summing-up of the British occupation, but is chiefly concerned with the suppression of Mahdism, and with an account of the Coptic community.

The Life and Correspondence of the Right Hon. Hugh C. E. Childers, 1827-1896, by his son, Lieut.-Col. Spencer Childers (London, Murray), deals chiefly with the facts of Mr. Childers's career during his tenure of office as First Lord of the Admiralty, Secretary of State for War, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Home Secretary. The information and documents given for the period when Mr. Childers was at the War Office are fuller than for his other experiences, and cover much of the preliminary stages of the South African difficulty.

Among the numerous books dealing with the South African question, one of considerable importance is *The Second Boer War, 1899-1900*, by John P. Wisser, Capt. U.S.A. (Kansas City, Hudson-Kimberly Publishing Co.).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: S. Brodhurst, *The Merchants of the Staple* (Law Quarterly Review, January); *The First Century of the East India Company* (Quarterly Review, January); B. Williams, *The Foreign Policy of England under Walpole*, V. (English Historical Review, April); *The Character of Queen Victoria* (Quarterly Review, April).

FRANCE.

The Société de l'Histoire de France has just issued the *Mémoires* of the Vicomte de Turenne. During the present year it expects to distribute Vol. III. of the *Journal du Chevalier de Quincy* (ed. Lecestre) and Vol. I. of the journal of Jean Vallier, relating to the Fronde (ed. Courteault and de Vaissière).

All readers of Froissart who know how infinitely on every literary ground the ancient translation by Lord Berners is to be preferred to all others, and how difficult it is to procure, will welcome the announcement that a reprint, with an introduction by Mr. William Paton Ker, has been published by Mr. David Nutt in his series of Tudor Translations.

The second issue of the *Répertoire Méthodique de l'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine de la France* (Paris, George Bellais), edited by Brière and Caron, covers the year 1899. It is a volume of 229 pages composed with admirable care, and embraces 3638 items or titles. It is needless to say that it is indispensable to the serious student of modern French history.

An organization has been formed in Paris, with Professor Aulard as general secretary, for the purpose of publishing a *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique de la Révolution Française*, marked by the highest scholarship. It is intended that the work, published in parts, shall comprise four octavo volumes, and cost about a hundred francs.

M. Aulard will shortly publish Vol. XIV. of his *Recueil des Actes du Comité de Salut Public*, and the fifth and last volume, with a general index, of his *Paris pendant la Réaction Thermidorienne et sous le Directoire*.

M. Gabriel Hanotaux has in press a *Histoire de France Contemporaine* (Paris, Combet) extending from 1871 to the present time.

Cent Jours du Siège à la Préfecture de Police, by M. A. Cresson (Paris, Plon), is the account of an episode in the Franco-Prussian war, covering the period from November 2, 1870, to February 11, 1871, and written by the then prefect of police.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Droin, *L'Expulsion des Jésuites sous Henri IV. et leur Rappel* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, May); A. Liard, *Saint-Simon et les États Généraux* (Revue Historique, May); G. Lacour-Gayet, *La Bataille de M. de Conflans, 1759* (Revue Historique, May); A. Vandal, *La Conquête de Paris par Bonaparte, 1799-1800* (Revue des Deux-Mondes, April 15, May 1, 15); M. Philippson, *La Paix d'Amiens et la Politique Générale*

de Napoléon I^{er} (Revue Historique, March, May) ; G. Caudrillier, *Le Complot de l'An XII.*, I. (Revue Historique, March).

ITALY, SPAIN.

The second volume of Professor Giuseppe Mazzatinti's *Gli Archivi della Storia d'Italia*, recently published, contains inventories or descriptions of thirty-odd archives, chiefly municipal, and largely described by Mazzatinti himself upon the basis of personal researches.

In the *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria*, XXIII. 3-4, the principal contents, beside continuations of writings which we have already mentioned, are a long article by Signore Pietro Egidi of Girgenti on the "Fraternità dei Disciplinati" at Viterbo, and one by Signor V. Federici on Santa Maria Antiqua and the latest excavations of the Forum Romanum.

Dr. Vito La Mantia has lately published (Palermo, Alberto Reber, pp. cciv, 356) his critical edition of the *Antiche Consuetudini della Città di Sicilia*, important for the medieval history of the island.

A newly founded Asociación de la Librería at Madrid, apparently modelled after the Cercle Français de la Librairie, will publish fortnightly a general *Bibliografía Español*, which may be had through Messrs. Lemcke and Buechner, New York.

We are indebted to Señor Enrique Serrano Fatigati, president of the Sociedad Española de Excursiones, for several issues of the *Boletín* of that society, containing interesting archaeological articles by him, which he has finally combined into a monograph, illustrated by excellent photo-types and photogravures, on *Escultura Romanica en España* (Madrid, Imprenta de San Francisco de Sales, pp. 65). It is a common opinion that the sculpture accompanying Spanish medieval architecture is all symbolic. This Senor Fatigati controverts, showing, in this monograph and in another on two ancient churches, *Sépúlveda y Santa Maria de Nieva*, many interesting examples of Romanesque capitals, of grotesques and of representations of the forms of nature.

The Spanish People, by Major Martin A. S. Hume (New York, D. Appleton and Co.), is the first volume in the "Great Peoples" series, edited by Professor York Powell. Mr. Hume describes the racial elements which have entered into the Spanish people, their development in the history of the Spanish peninsula, and their influence upon European civilization.

In the *Boletín* of the Royal Spanish Academy of History, XXXVII. 6, Señor R. Ramirez de Arellano brings forward new facts and documents relating to Beatriz Enriquez de Arana, tending to show that she was neither noble nor rich, but a poor orphan seduced by Columbus.

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND.

The German historical congress ("Versammlung deutscher Historiker") is announced as to hold its next meeting at Heidelberg at Easter of 1902.

Over six hundred signatures have been obtained to a petition, drawn up by the historical professors of Marburg, and addressed to the imperial chancellor, praying that the Prussian Historical Institute in Rome may be so reorganized as to become, upon a broader basis, a German Historical Institute. The retirement of Dr. W. Friedensburg was the special occasion of the present movement. Professor Ludwig Pastor of Innsbruck has been appointed director of the Austrian Institute in the place of Hofrath Theodor von Sickel.

The Macmillan Co. announce *A Short History of Germany*, by Dr. Ernest F. Henderson, whose *History of Germany in the Middle Ages* (London, Bell, 1894) is well known.

The historical section of the Prussian General Staff is about to begin the issue of a series entitled *Urkundliche Beiträge und Forschungen zur Geschichte des preussischen Heeres* (Berlin, E. S. Mittler and Son). There will be two or three issues a year, each complete in itself, and consisting now of a collection of related documents, now of an historical monograph.

Dr. Florenz Landmann has published a substantial contribution to the study of the religious condition of Germany in the fifteenth century under the title *Das Predigtwesen in Westfalen in der letzten Zeit des Mittelalters* (Münster, Aschendorff). It is the first of a series of *Vorreformationsgeschichtliche Studien* edited by Professor Finke of Münster.

Messrs. Schwetschke and Sons of Berlin are to publish a critical edition of Zwingli's works, edited by Professors Egli of Zurich and G. Finster of Basel.

The first of the volumes to be published for the University of Pennsylvania by Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co., who have undertaken the issue of its historical series, will be *Selections from the Writings of Zwingli*, edited by Professor Samuel M. Jackson of New York University.

In the April number of the *Deutsche Rundschau* Dr. Richard Ehrenberg begins a series of articles on the Fuggers and the growth of their property and business enterprises.

At the last "Historikertag," held in Halle, an edition of the political correspondence of Charles V. was actively discussed. The plan is now assured of success, the new Austrian Historical Commission having adopted it as a part of its programme.

Dr. Goetz's *Franz Heinrich Reusch : Eine Darstellung seiner Lebensarbeit* (Gotha, Perthes), will be welcomed as an account of the life and labor of one of Germany's most eminent scholars, and as a contribution to the history of the Old Catholic movement.

Subventions from the provincial and district governments, the city of Metz and private contributors have permitted the "Gesellschaft für lothringische Geschichte" to attempt a larger programme. Arrangements have been made for the publication of series of the chronicles of

Lorraine and of Metz ; of *Regesten* of the bishops ; of the *Schreinsrollen* of the thirteenth century ; and of calendars of documents in the Vatican archives.

The first volume of *Registres du Conseil de Genève* will shortly be published by M. Émile Rivoire, for the Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Genève. The series will consist of four volumes, of which the first will cover the period from February 26, 1409, to February 6, 1461.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals : J. Fickers, *Das langobardische und die skandinavischen Rechte* (Mittheilungen des Instituts für oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung, XXII. 1) ; *Sophia Dorothea of Celle* (Edinburgh Review, January) ; O. Hintze, *Der Oesterreichische und der Preussische Beamtenstaat im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXVI. 3) ; P. Haake, *Ein Politisches Testament König August's des Starken* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXVII. 1) ; A. G. Keller, *The Beginnings of German Colonization* (Yale Review, May) ; F. Meinecke, *Die Bismarck-litteratur der letzten Jahre* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXVII. 1).

NETHERLANDS.

A portion of Dutch diplomatic history particularly important to the student of colonial New York, and indeed to the student of British colonial history at large, is illustrated in an elaborate Leiden doctoral dissertation by N. Japikse, *De Verwickelingen tusschen de Republiek en Engeland van 1660-1665* (Leiden, S. C. van Doesburgh, pp. lxviii, 476). Dr. Japikse has studied with minute care the papers of DeWitt, Sir George Downing, Clarendon, Comenge, etc.

The twenty-first volume of the *Bijdragen en Mededeelingen* of the Utrecht Historical Society contains a report on the condition of the Dutch West India Company, presented to the States of Holland in 1633 by the Amsterdam Chamber, an important recovered fragment of the lost archives of the company.

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.

Messrs. Williams and Norgate will shortly publish the concluding volume (Vol. IV.) of *Old Northern Runic Monuments of Scandinavia and England*, by the late Professor George Stephens.

The Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfund of Upsala, with aid from the authorities of the city of Stockholm, has begun the publication, under the scholarly editorial care of Professor Karl Hildebrand, of a series of volumes relating to the history of that city. A beginning has been made with *Stockholms Stads Privilegiebref, 1423-1700*, of which the first part (Stockholm, Wahlström and Widstrand, pp. 160), embraces the patents down to that given by Gustavus Adolphus in February, 1614, inclusive.

AMERICA.

Messrs. A. C. McClurg and Co. have just issued a *History of the American People*, by Dr. Francis Newton Thorpe.

The J. B. Lippincott Co. publish *The History of Medicine in the United States*, by Dr. Francis Randolph Packard. The period covered is that from the earliest English colonization to 1800.

The latest issues in the series of *Johns Hopkins Studies* are monographs on State Activities in Relation to Labor in the United States, and on the History of Suffrage in Virginia, by Mr. W. F. Willoughby of the U. S. Department of Labor and Professor J. A. C. Chandler, of Richmond College, respectively.

The publication of the seventy-first volume of *The Jesuit Relations* (Burrows Bros.) completes the entire work with the exception of the index, which will constitute Vols. LXXII. and LXXIII. of the series. Volume LXXII. will contain Mr. Thwaites's final preface, in which he will review the whole undertaking. The first volume was published in November, 1896; the seventy-first, in December, 1900.

An edition of the *Bay Psalm Book* will shortly be published by Mr. James Warrington (Philadelphia) as one of a series of facsimile reprints of famous American musical books. Mr. Warrington has also in preparation a bibliography to be entitled *Short Titles of Books Relating to or Illustrating the History and Practice of Psalmody in the United States, 1620-1820*.

A new installment (Vol. II., part 7) of *The Georgian Period*, by Messrs. G. C. Gardner, Sylvester Baxter and others (Boston, American Architect and Building News Co.) has just appeared, and contains thirty-three plates of colonial houses with measurements, as well as descriptive articles. The drawings were made by pupils of the Architectural Department of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, during the summer schools of 1894 and 1895.

Earl Grey is reported to have discovered among the papers of his family, coming down from the first earl, an original manuscript diary kept by Major John André during the years 1777 and 1778, with maps by his own hand illustrating the progress of the American war.

The J. B. Lippincott Company have just ready a cheaper edition of Elliot's *Debates*.

John Marshall, by Professor James Bradley Thayer of the Harvard Law School, appears as a new volume in the Riverside Biographical Series (Houghton, Mifflin and Co.).

A reprint of *The War of 1812*, by Major John Richardson, is shortly to be published by the Historical Publishing Company (Toronto). This is the first reprint since the original edition in 1842. A biography of the author and a bibliography will be furnished by Mr. A. C. Casselman.

Under the title *George W. Julian; Some Impressions*, Mrs. Grace Julian Clarke, daughter of Mr. Julian, has set forth in a quite small book, privately printed, the story of her father's life, especially of the

years remembered by her, and a sketch of his characteristics. It is an interesting picture, of a life devoted to high public aims and of a character truly admirable and winning. A fine portrait of Mr. Julian, from a photograph taken when he was sixty-one, and a figure of his death-mask, are given. We understand that the Bowen-Merrill Co. of Indianapolis now have a few copies of the memorial on sale.

Messrs. D. Appleton and Co. have published, under the title *A Sailor's Log*, recollections of forty years of naval life by Rear-Admiral Robley D. Evans, U. S. N.

The Century Co. has just issued a new and cheaper edition, in four volumes, of *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, edited by Messrs. Robert U. Johnson and Clarence C. Buel.

The Albert Shaw lectures on diplomatic history for 1900, delivered at the Johns Hopkins University by Dr. James M. Callahan, have been published (Johns Hopkins Press) under the title, *The Diplomatic History of the Southern Confederacy*.

Messrs. Doubleday, Page and Co. have published *Up from Slavery*, the autobiography of Mr. Booker T. Washington, the present principal of Tuskegee Institute.

The Philippine Information Society has now issued seven pamphlets of its first series of ten. It is intended to compile in each pamphlet those portions of the various governmental documents which deal with a certain period or event, thus providing readers with a documentary history in convenient and summary form. The current series comprises : (1) José Rizal and the Insurgent Movement of 1896 ; (2) Aguinaldo ; (3) The Insurgent Government of 1898 ; (4) Our Relations with the Insurgents prior to the Fall of Manila, 1898 ; (5) Aguinaldo and the American Generals ; (6) Iloilo ; (7) Outbreak of Hostilities, February 1899 ; (8) Efforts for an Armistice, April and July 1899 ; (9) Efforts at Recognition ; (10) Present Condition.

Messrs. G. E. Littlefield and Co. (Boston) announce *The Westbrook Papers*, letters of Colonel Thomas Westbrook and others, relative to Indian affairs in Maine from 1722 to 1726, edited by Mr. W. Blake Trask.

A History of Sanford, Maine, 1661-1900, by Edwin Emery, has been edited and published by his son, Mr. W. Morrell Emery (Fall River, Mass.).

Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin and Co. have published, under the title *Jonathan Edwards: A Retrospect*, the addresses delivered at the memorial service in Northampton, upon the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the dismissal of Edwards from the pastorate of the First Church of that town. The volume is edited by Professor H. Norman Gardiner of Smith College, and contains historical papers by Dr. A. V. G. Allen, Dr. Egbert C. Smyth, and others.

Faneuil Hall and Faneuil Hall Market, by Mr. Abram English Brown (Boston, Lee and Shepard), includes a biography of Peter Faneuil and his sister, as well as the history of the famous building itself.

The twenty-ninth report on the Boston Records, entitled simply *A Volume of Records*, etc., and prepared by the Registry Department in the place of the late Record Commissioners, contains miscellaneous papers relating to the great fire of 1700, lists of freemen, port arrivals, immigrants, etc.

Mr. Henry S. Nourse, of Lancaster, Mass., has published two pamphlets, of use for local history, *A Supplement to the Early Records and Military Annals of Lancaster*, and *A Bibliography of Lancastriana*.

The *Early Records of the Town of Portsmouth* have been published by the state of Rhode Island in a well-printed volume of 462 pages, edited by Mr. Clarence S. Brigham, Librarian of the Rhode Island Historical Society. The volume includes the text of the first book of records of the town council, extending from 1639 to 1697, and also many deeds, wills, inventories, powers of attorney, inquests, etc., some later in date than 1697. There are indexes of names and of subjects.

Messrs. Preston and Rounds (Providence, R. I.) have in press *The Dorr War; or the Constitutional Struggle in Rhode Island*, by the late Arthur M. Mowry, with an introduction by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart. Mr. Mowry may be remembered by our readers as the author of an article on "Tammany Hall and the Dorr War," in our third volume.

The New York State Library has issued as Nos. 23 and 24 of its bibliographies, a *Reference List on Connecticut Local History*, compiled by Mr. Charles A. Flagg, and a *Bibliography of New York Colonial History*, by Mr. Flagg and Mr. Judson T. Jennings. It is expected that a list showing what is available on Maine local history in both the New York State and Bowdoin College libraries will be ready in June.

For several issues past, the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* has devoted much space to bibliographies of the city, in various aspects—its history, its churches, its water-supply, fire department, streets, almanacs, directories, libraries, schools, etc.

In the July number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History* the most interesting new matter is a series of notes of travel through the colony in 1772, from the north branch of the Susquehanna to the Beaver River, kept by Rev. John Ettwein, and now derived from his manuscript in the Moravian archives at Bethlehem. The Moravian Indian town of Wyalusing being abandoned in June of the year named, Ettwein conducted a division of the inhabitants thence to Friedenstadt, meantime keeping this record.

The second volume of Dr. Julius Sachse's *The German Sectarians of Pennsylvania* has recently appeared. This volume covers the period from 1742 to 1800, and may fairly be said to complete the collection of the

historical material relating to the Ephrata Cloister and the Dunkers. The legends and the philosophy of the sect are analyzed, and many facsimiles of manuscripts are given.

In the April number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* we find, beside continued articles, the beginning of a systematic list of Virginia newspapers to be found in various public libraries. A beginning is here made with the library of Congress; the collections of the Virginia Historical Society, the Virginia State Library, etc., will follow.

The Virginia Historical Society has performed a highly useful service in issuing, in a pamphlet of 120 pages, a detailed *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Collection* of the society. It were to be wished that more societies would do this. We understand that it is the intention of the Tennessee Historical Society to do so.

Mr. W. P. Willey has written *An Inside View of the Formation of the State of West Virginia* (Wheeling, News Publishing Co.), with characteristic sketches of the pioneers in that movement.

Dr. William E. Dodd, professor of history in Randolph-Macon College, has been enabled by the liberality of a citizen of Richmond to begin the issue, on behalf of that college, of a series called by the benefactor's name, *The John P. Branch Historical Papers of Randolph-Macon College*, intended as an annual publication, to include a prize essay (this year on the famous Rev. Devereux Jarratt), and a variety of original historical documents. In this first issue Dr. Dodd has reprinted, from pamphlets now out of print, a number of letters of Col. Leven Powell and Rev. David Griffith, relating to the Revolutionary war and the election of 1800 in Virginia, the latter treated from the Federalist point of view.

No. 2 of the "James Sprunt Historical Monographs," published by the University of North Carolina, is devoted to Nathaniel Macon. First is printed a conscientious and sensible analysis of Macon's Congressional career, by Mr. Edwin Mood Wilson. This is followed by an interesting and characteristic series of his letters, edited with full notes by Professor Kemp P. Battle. There are twenty-three of them, ranging in date from 1796 to 1828. A letter written in 1826 by Willie P. Mangum is added. The pamphlet (pp. 116), though open to some criticism in respect to arrangement, is a contribution of distinct value to political history.

In a poem of some length entitled *The White Doe* (Philadelphia, Lippincott), Mrs. Sallie Southall Cotten, of North Carolina, has embodied all the historical facts and traditional lore connected with the birth of Virginia Dare and the disappearance and supposed survival of Sir Walter Raleigh's lost colony.

Mr. William Garrott Brown, of the Library of Harvard University, has written a small history of the state of Alabama in the series of state histories now in course of publication by the University Publishing Company.

Mr. Charles A. Hanna (New York) has printed privately a volume entitled *Historical Collections of Harrison County, Ohio*. The book treats at length of the leading elements of the population—Scotch-Irish, Quakers, "Pennsylvania Dutch," Virginians and New-Englanders,—and also contains, as Part II., an alphabetized collection of land patents, early marriage records, graveyard records, and abstracts of wills from 1813 to 1860. Part III. is a compilation of genealogies.

Number XVI. of the Filson Club Publications (Louisville, John P. Morton and Co.) is *Boonesborough: Its Founding, Pioneer Struggles, Indian Experiences, Transylvanian Days, and Revolutionary Annals*, by Mr. George W. Ranck, who has given much time to the history of Kentucky.

An interesting contribution to Texan history is *The Evolution of a State*, compiled from the reminiscences of Mr. Noah Smithwick, who came to Texas in the early '20s, by Mrs. Nanna Smithwick Donaldson (Austin, Texas, Gammel Book Co.).

The April *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association is entirely given up to a careful and excellent monograph on the San Jacinto Campaign, by Professor Eugene C. Barker, the fruit of much critical study, and accompanied by some interesting documents not before published, or not before printed in English.

Father Chrysostomus Verwyst has written an account of the *Life and Labors of Rt. Rev. Frederic Baraga, First Bishop of Marquette, Michigan* (Milwaukee, M. H. Wiltzius and Co.). The volume also contains sketches of other Indian missionaries in the Northwest.

On Memorial Day, in Sioux City, a monument was dedicated in honor of Sergeant Charles Floyd, a member of the Lewis and Clark expedition, who was buried near that spot on August 20, 1804. An inscription states that the shaft was erected by the Floyd Memorial Association, assisted by the United States and by the state of Iowa.

The Early Empire Builders of the Great West, by Moses K. Armstrong (St. Paul, Minn., E. W. Porter), is compiled, with additions, from the author's *Early History of Dakota Territory* (1866), and is a record of pioneer experiences nearly half a century ago.

In December the *Quarterly* of the Oregon Historical Society printed an elaborately illustrated account of the Oregon Trail, by Professor F. G. Young of Eugene; in the March number the principal article is one on the political history of Oregon from 1853 to 1865, by Hon. George H. Williams.

Dr. William A. Mowry, who has spent a long time in conscientious research into his subject, has just published a volume entitled *Marcus Whitman and the Early Days of Oregon* (Boston, Silver, Burdett and Co.), in which he aims, without ignoring or being uncritical of the documentary evidence, to uphold a quite different view of the story of Whitman from that which Professor Bourne set forth in earlier pages of this volume.

University of Toronto Studies, History, First Series, Vol. 5, is the Review of Historical Publications relating to Canada for the Year 1900, edited by Professor George M. Wrong and Mr. H. H. Langton (pp. 226). It is composed upon the same plan as its predecessors, but has, beside its reviews of books and articles, an extended biographical notice of the late Sir Daniel Wilson, with a list of his publications.

The Story of the Dominion, by J. Castell Hopkins (Philadelphia, J. C. Winston Co.), is a history of Canada from its early discovery and settlement to the present time.

Early Trading Companies of New France : A Contribution to the History of Commerce and Discovery in North America, by Mr. H. P. Biggar, author of the article on Lescarbot printed in our present issue, has appeared. The monograph contains an extensive appendix of sources. Copies may be obtained of the Librarian, University of Toronto, Canada.


Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. P. Turner, *Colonial Agencies in England* (Political Science Quarterly, March); Woodrow Wilson, *Colonies and Nation* (Harper's Magazine, April-July); C. J. Bullock, *Direct Taxes and the Federal Constitution*, II. (Yale Review, May); B. J. Clinch, *The Formation of the Filipino People* (Yale Review, May); Grover Cleveland, *The Venezuela Boundary Controversy* (Century Magazine, June, July).



INDEX

AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. VI

 *The names of contributors are printed in small capitals*

- Abbo, of Fleury, 430-432, 436.
- Abbott, Evelyn, *A History of Greece*, Part III., by G. W. B. (Review), 346.
- Abbott, Lyman, *Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews*, by C. H. Toy (Review), 772.
- Abbott, Wilbur C., remarks by, 421.
- Abingdon, rising of the burgesses of, 663-668.
- Acadia, 683, 685, 692.
- Acosta, Joseph, 679.
- Acta Sanctorum*, the, 633.
- Act of Toleration, the, 498.
- Adam Duncan*, by H. W. Wilson (Review), 388.
- Adams, Charles Francis, 424, 427; Charles K., 427; George B., 424, 425, 427; Henry, 427; Herbert B., 414, 424, 427; John, 302, 509, 725; John Quincy, 23, 25, 204-208, 213, 230-234; Samuel, 302.
- ADAMS, CHARLES FRANCIS, *The Sifted Grain and the Grain Sifters*, 197.
- ADAMS, GEORGE BURTON, *Calendar of Documents preserved in France, illustrative of the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, edited by J. Horace Round (Review), 351.
- Adams, John Quincy, Letter of, 1811* (Documents), 341.
- Addison, Daniel D., *The Clergy in American Life and Letters*, by BARRETT WENDELL (Review), 576.
- Addison, Joseph, 643.
- Adson, abbot, 432, 436.
- Africa, trade of, 254.
- Airy, Dr. Osmund (editor), Burnet's *History of My Own Time* (Review), 169.
- Ajax*, the clipper, 454, 455.
- Alabama, the Kansas question in, 39-43 public lands in, 28.
- Alabama Journal*, the, 42.
- Albany, colonial elections in, 266-268.
- Albany Advertiser*, the, 457.
- Albany County, 261, 266-270.
- Albany Evening Journal*, the, 450, 451.
- Albany Evening Register*, the, 449.
- Albany Regency, the, 449, 450, 458.
- Alberoni, Cardinal, 644.
- Albornoz, Cardinal, 637, 638.
- Alexander family, the, 262.
- Alexander the Great*, by Benjamin Wheeler (Review), 113.
- Alexander VI., 640.
- Alfonse, Jean, 671, 682.
- Alfonso of Aragon, King of Naples, 639.
- Alger, Gen. Russell A., 413.
- Algiers, the government of, 496.
- Allègre, Governor, 483, 486.
- Amalfi, trade of, 254.
- America, History of, before Columbus, according to Documents and Approved Authors*, by P. de Roo, by H. W. H. (Review), 799.
- America, History of the New World called*, Vol. II., by Edward J. Payne, by FRANK RUSSELL (Review), 796.
- America, A Literary History of*, by Barrett Wendell, by WALTER C. BRONSON (Review), 807.
- America, Monographic History of, a project for, 424, 425.
- American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the, 278-280, 290, 291, 295, 296.
- American Citizen*, the, 447, 448.

- American Diplomacy, A Century of*, by John W. Foster, by JOHN HOLLADAY LATANÉ (Review), 587.
- American Diplomacy, A Trial Bibliography of*, by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, 848-866.
- American Ecclesiology (paper), 416.
- American Historical Association, Annual Report of the, for 1899* (Review), 606.
- American Historical Association, Meeting of the, at Detroit and Ann Arbor*, 413.
- American Historical Association, officers and committees of the, 427, 428.
- American History, A Survey of*, by Howard W. Caldwell (Review), 388.
- American History told by Contemporaries*, Vol. III., edited by Albert B. Hart (Review), 590.
- American People, The Expansion of the, Social and Territorial*, by Edwin E. Sparks, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 805.
- American Relations in the Pacific and Far East, 1784-1900*, by James M. Callahan, by HIRAM BINGHAM, JR. (Review), 827.
- American Slave-Trade, The: An Account of its Origin, Growth and Suppression*, by John R. Spears, by EDWARD D. COLLINS (Review), 586.
- Amersfoort, 9, 14.
- Ami des Hommes*, 237.
- Amiens, Preliminary Stages of the Peace of*, by H. M. Bowman (Review), 366.
- Amis Réunis, the, 241, 242.
- Andrews, Charles M., 425, 427.
- Andros, Sir Edmund, 718, 720.
- ANGELL, JAMES B., *Selected Essays*, by Eugene Schuyler (Review), 839; *The Turkish Capitulations*, 254.
- Angell, President James B., of the University of Michigan, 413, 415, 418, 423.
- Anglo-Saxon migration, the, 197, 204, 207, 211.
- Anjou, the Duke of (1381), 445.
- Annales Ecclesiastici*, 430.
- Annales Hirsangienses*, 430.
- Annalista Saxo*, 431.
- Annam, the government of, 496.
- Anne of Beaujeu, 433.
- Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1899* (Review), 606.
- Antilles, the French, political conditions in, 475-497.
- Anti-slavery movement, the, 230-234.
- Apostolic Age, The; Its Life, Doctrine, Worship and Polity*, by James V. Bartlett, by FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE (Review), 537.
- Applegate, Jesse, 293.
- Arbe, the island of, 633.
- Archæological Reports of Ontario, The* (Review), 393.
- Argus, the, 449-451.
- Arkansas, public land question in, 31.
- Armstrong, William, letter of, 517.
- Arnold, Thomas, 217.
- Arte, Scienza e Fede ai Giorni di Dante* (Review), 835.
- Aruka, plantation on the, 59.
- Ashley, W. J., *Surveys, Historic and Economic*, by CHARLES H. HULL (Review), 793.
- Assisi, The Story of*, by Lina Duff Gordon, by FERDINAND SCHWILL (Review), 608.
- Astolphus, King of the Lombards, 634.
- Atkinson, C. T., *Michel de l'Hospital*, by HENRY M. BAIRD (Review), 127.
- Atkinson, Dr. G. H., 285.
- Atlanta, 466, 469, 470, 472.
- Aube, Admiral, 482, 483, 485.
- Augusta, Ga., 470, 471.
- Aumale, Duc d', 675; duchy of, 675.
- Aurora*, the Philadelphia, 448.
- Austria, trading privileges of, in Turkey, 256, 258.
- Avignon, 637.
- B., G. L., *Zauberwahn, Inquisitionen und Hexenprozess im Mittelalter und die Entstehung der grossen Hexenverfolgung*, von Joseph Hansen (Review), 609.
- B., G. W., *A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great*, by J. B. Bury (Review), 345; *A History of Greece*, Part III., by Evelyn Abbott (Review), 346; *Rome: Its Rise and Fall*, by P. V. N. Myers (Review), 382.
- Bacon, Mrs. J. E., 736.
- Bagley Wood, 665.
- BAIRD, HENRY M., *The De Forests of Avesnes*, by J. W. De Forest (Review); *Luther and the German Reformation*, by Thomas M. Lindsay (Review), 357; *Michel de l'Hospital*, by C. T. Atkinson (Review), 127.
- Baird, Henry M., *Theodore Beza, the*

- Counsellor of the French Reformation*, by PAUL VAN DYKE (Review), 551.
- Baker, Alpheus, 41, 43, 47.
- Baldwin, Simeon E., 416.
- Baltimore Sun*, the, 464.
- Bancroft, Frederic, *The Life of William H. Seward*, by DANIEL H. CHAMBERLAIN (Review), 152.
- Bancroft, George, 220, 221.
- Bancroft's *Oregon*, 292, 296.
- Banking in the United States, A History of*, by John Jay Knox, by DAVIS RICH DEWEY (Review), 377.
- Barbour, Sir David, 495.
- Barima, colony on the river, 59-61.
- Barnwell District, 736.
- Baronius, Cardinal, 430, 432, 675.
- Barré, Nicolas, 679.
- Barrow, Henry, Separatist, and the Exiled Church of Amsterdam*, by Fred. J. Powicke, by WILLISTON WALKER (Review), 777.
- Barruel, statements concerning Mirabeau by, 247.
- Barth, Dr., 242, 243.
- Bartlet, James V., *The Apostolic Age: Its Life, Doctrine, Worship and Polity*, by FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE (Review), 537.
- Basanier, French mathematician, 678.
- Bascom, John, *The Growth of Nationality in the United States* (Review), 172.
- Basnage, interpretation of the Treaty of Münster by, 56.
- Bassi, Ugo, 646.
- Bavaria, succession to, 246.
- Bayles, George J., paper by, 416.
- BEALE, JOSEPH H., JR., *Historical Jurisprudence*, by Guy C. Lee (Review), 531.
- Beauharnais, Eugène de, 646.
- Beauregard, General, 467.
- BECKER, CARL, *Nominations in Colonial New York*, 260.
- Beissenteufel, Frederic, grant to, 58.
- Bell, Capt. E. R., 45.
- Belleforest, history by, 678.
- Belluzzi College, 643.
- Belluzzi, Giambattista, 642.
- Beltran, diary of Captain Mateo, 63.
- Benedict XIV., 645.
- Benjamin, Park, 463.
- Bennett, Frank M., *The Monitor and the Navy under Steam*, by H. C. TAYLOR (Review), 820.
- Bennett, James Gordon, 456, 458-465.
- Benton, T. H., public land policy of, 22-24.
- Berengarius II., 635.
- Beresford, Capt. John P., letter of, 520; letter to, 519.
- Bergen, 8, 9.
- Berkshire, 663, 666.
- Berlin, Mirabeau's mission to, 235, 239, 241-253.
- Berri, Duke of (1410), 441, 444.
- Berrio, Don Antonio, letter of, 52.
- Berthaut, General, 768, 769.
- Beza, Theodore, the Counsellor of the French Reformation (1519-1605)*, by Henry M. Baird, by PAUL VAN DYKE (Review), 551.
- Biard's *Relation*, 690.
- Bibliography of American Diplomacy, A Trial*, by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, 848-866.
- Bibliothèque des Merveilles*, 435.
- Bicknell, Edward, *Territorial Acquisitions of the United States* (Review), 173.
- Biedermann, Karl (deceased), 868.
- Biencourt, André de, 675; Charles de, 675; Florimond de, 675; Jacques de, 675; Jean de, Seigneur de Pourtrincourt, 675, 683-689.
- BIGELOW, JOHN, JR., *The Storming of Stony Point on the Hudson*, by Henry P. Johnston (Review), 144.
- BIGELOW, MELVILLE MADISON, *The County Palatine of Durham*, by Gailard T. Lapsley (Review), 123.
- BIGGAR, H. P., *The French Hakluyt; Marc Lesca'bot of Verrins*, 671.
- BINGHAM, HIRAM, JR., *American Relations in the Pacific and the Far East*, by James M. Callahan (Review), 827.
- Bispal, Father, letter from, 61.
- Bittinger, Lucy F., *The Germans in Colonial Times*, by M. D. LEARNED (Review), 813.
- Black, J. Sutherland (editor), *Encyclopaedia Biblica: A Critical Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. II., by C. H. TOY (Review), 770.
- Blackburn, Vernon (editor), *From Capetown to Ladysmith*, by G. W. Steevens (Review), 170.
- BLACKMAR, FRANK W., *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer; The Dairy and Itinerary of Francisco Garcés*, by Elliott Coues (Review), 141.
- Blair, Francis P., 450.

- Blancsubé, deputy from Cochinchina, 492.
 Bliss, William R., *Colonial Times on Buzara's Bay* (Review), 391.
 Bloch, Camille, *Études sur l'Histoire Économique de la France (1760-1789)*, by HENRY E. BOURNE (Review), 784.
 Blue Jacket on the Wakarusa, 44.
 Bonaparte, Napoleon, 645, 646, 649.
 Bonelli, Camillo, 642.
 Boniface VIII., 637.
 Borgia, Caesar, 640.
Bostonian, the, 456.
 Bourinot, Sir John G., *Canada under British Rule*, by WILLIAM MACDONALD (Review), 830.
 Bourne, Edward G., 414, 419, 427, 428.
 BOURNE, EDWARD GAYLORD, *The Legend of Marcus Whitman*, 276.
 Bourne, Henry E., 419.
 BOURNE, HENRY E., *Études sur l'Histoire Économique de la France (1760-1789)*, par Camille Bloch (Review), 784; *Richelieu and the Growth of French Power*, by James B. Perkins (Review), 561.
 Bowdoin, George S., 416.
 Bowen, Dr. Clarence W., 425, 427.
 Bowman, H. M., *Preliminary Stages of the Peace of Amiens* (Review), 366.
 Bowman, Jacob N., *The Protestant Interest in Cromwell's Foreign Relations*, by Guernsey Jones (Review), 837.
 BOYNTON, H. V., *Military Reminiscences of the Civil War*, by Gen. Jacob D. Cox (Review), 602.
 Brabant, 662.
 Braccio, the condottiere, 638.
 Bradford's *Gazette*, 447.
 Brady, Cyrus T., *Stephen Decatur* (Review), 389.
 Brazil, voyage to, 671-673, 679.
 Breasted, James H., *A New Chapter in the Life of Thutmose III.*, by CHARLES F. KENT (Review), 832.
 BREASTED, JAMES HENRY, *Sesostris*, by Kurt Sethe (Review), 535.
 Breckinridge, Vice-President J. C., 33.
 Breuckelen, 9, 14.
 Briarly, Lieut., letter of, 522.
 Bright, Professor William (deceased), 868.
 Broglie, Jacques Victor Albert, Duc de (deceased), 616, 765.
 BRONSON, WALTER C., *A Literary History of America*, by Barrett Wendell (Review), 807.
 Bronx peninsula, the, 696, 704.
 Brooklyn, 6, 8, 10.
 Brooks, Noah, *Henry Knox*, by OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD (Review), 367.
 Brouillet, Vicar-General of Walla-Walla, 282.
 Brown, G. W., 45; John, 46.
 BROWN, MARSHALL S., *The Men Who Made the Nation*, by Edwin E. Sparks (Review), 818.
 BROWN, WILLIAM GARROTT, *Political Parties in the United States*, by Jesse Macy (Review), 592.
 Brown University, 736.
 Browne, J. Ross, 282.
 Bruce, Richard I., *The Forward Policy and its Results*, by ALFRED L. P. DENNIS (Review), 569.
 Brunswick, Ferdinand of, 242, 251.
 Bryan, William J., 213, 214.
 Bryant, William Cullen, 453.
 Buchanan, James V., 34-36.
Buckinghamshire, Despatches and Correspondence of John, Second Earl of, edited by Adelaide D'A. Collier (Review), 387.
 Buckle, H. T., 217, 218, 230.
 Budde, Karl, *Religion of Israel to the Exile*, by C. H. TOY (Review), 112.
 Buell, Jesse, 449.
 Buell, Augustus C., *Paul Jones, Founder of the American Navy*, by EDWARD FIELD (Review), 589.
 Buenos Ayres, 508, 509.
 Buffalo conference of 1848, the, 208.
 Buffalo convention of the Free-Soil party (1848), 28.
 Buford, Major Jefferson, 39-48.
Buford Expedition to Kansas, The, by WALTER L. FLEMING, 38.
 Bulfinch, Judith, 302; Thomas, 302.
 Bull Creek, Kan., 46.
 Bullock, Charles J., *Essays on the Monetary History of the United States*, by DAVIS RICH DEWEY (Review), 579.
Bureau of American Ethnology, Seventeenth Annual Report, Vol. II., by FRANK RUSSELL (Review), 840.
 Burgundy, John, Duke of, 441, 442.
 Burke, Ullick R., *A History of Spain*, edited by Martin A. S. Hume, by CHARLES H. HASKINS (Review), 167.

- Burnet, Bishop, *History of My Own Time*, edited by Dr. Osmund Airy, Vol. II (Review), 169.
- BURNETT, EDMUND C., *An Outline of Political Growth in the Nineteenth Century*, by Edmund H. Sears (Review), 134.
- Burnett, Peter H., *Recollections of*, 293.
- Burr, Aaron, 448, 449; George L., 415, 416.
- BURR, GEORGE LINCOLN, *The Council of Constance to the Death of John Hus*, by James H. Wylie (Review), 548; *The Guiana Boundary*, 49; *The Year 1000 and the Antecedents of the Crusades*, 429.
- Burroughs, Stephen, 225, 226.
- Bury, J. B., *A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great*, by G. W. B. (Review), 345.
- Bury St. Edmunds, the town of, 659-663, 668.
- Bushwick, S.
- Busignano, 635.
- Butler, James, 268.
- Butler, Nicholas M. (editor), *Education in the United States* (Review), 393.
- Cabochian Ordinance, the, 442.
- Cabot Bibliography, with an Introductory Essay on the Careers of the Cabots*, by George P. Winship, by S. E. DAWSON (Review), 574.
- Cabris, Mme. de, 238.
- Caesar, Julius, 215.
- Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, by T. Rice Holmes (Review), 115.
- Caisse d'Escompte, 240.
- Caldwell, H. W., 428.
- Caldwell, Howard W., *A Survey of American History* (Review), 388.
- Calendar of Documents preserved in France, illustrative of the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, edited by J. Horace Round, by GEORGE BURTON ADAMS (Review), 351.
- Calhoun, John C., 203, 204, 206, 207, 725, 736.
- California, the public land question in, 35.
- Callahan, James M., *American Relations in the Pacific and the Far East*, by HIRAM BINGHAM, JR. (Review), 827.
- Calonne, Comptroller, 240, 241, 244, 246, 247, 252.
- Cambodia, 475.
- Campbell, Capt. Donald, letter of, 522.
- Canada, Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of* (Review), 392.
- Canada, public land policy of, 26.
- Canada under British Rule*, by Sir John G. Bourinot, by WILLIAM MACDONALD (Review), 830.
- Canajoharie, election of 1748 in, 266, 267.
- Canso, 676, 677, 685.
- Canton, trade with, 254.
- Cape Breton, 671.
- Capetown to Ladysmith, From*, by G. W. Steevens, edited by Vernon Blackburn (Review), 170.
- Capitulations, The Turkish*, by JAMES B. ANGELL, 254.
- Carlyle, Thomas, 215, 217, 218, 227, 230.
- Carmarthen, Lord, 247.
- Carnaud, Deputy, 488.
- Carpegna, the counts of, 635.
- Carre, Sir Robert, 718.
- Cartagena, 508.
- Cartersville, 468.
- Cartier, Jacques, 671, 674, 677, 680-682, 685, 688.
- Cartwright, Benjamin, 268.
- Casole, the castle of, 635.
- Cass, Lewis, 208.
- Castille, Pierre de, 689.
- Catherine II., policy of, 245.
- CATTERALL, RALPH C. H., *A Critical Examination of Irish History*, by T. Dunbar Ingram (Review), 779.
- Cayet, Palma, 682.
- Cely Papers, The; Selections from the Correspondence and Memoranda of the Cely Family, Merchants of the Staple*, edited by Henry E. Malden (Review), 384.
- Cent, the, 456.
- Century of American Diplomacy, A*, by John W. Foster, by JOHN HOLLADAY LATANÉ (Review), 587.
- Cerri, Antonio, 642.
- Chadwick, John W., *Theodore Parker, Preacher and Reformer*, by J. P. QUINCY (Review), 374.
- CHAMBERLAIN, DANIEL H., *The Life of William H. Seward*, by Frederic Bancroft (Review), 152.
- Chamberlain, Joseph, 495; the Hon. Mellen (deceased), 182.
- Chambord, Count of, 768.

- Champdocé, voyages of, 685.
 Champlain, voyages of, 680-685, 689-691.
Chapters from Illinois History, by Edward G. Mason, by EDWIN ERLE SPARKS (Review), 825.
 Charles II., 693, 698, 708.
 Charles V. of Germany, 255, 641, 673, 675.
 Charles V. of France, 440, 445.
 Charles VI. of France, 440-442, 445.
 Charles VII. of France, 442, 443, 445.
 Charles X. of France, 646.
 Charlevoix, F. X. de, *History and General Description of New France*, Vol. I., edited by John G. Shea (Review), 811.
Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis, 440.
 Chase, Judge, 725.
 Chattanooga-Atlanta campaign, the, 466, 469.
 Cheetham, James, 447-449.
 Cheyne, T. K. (editor), *Encyclopaedia Biblica; A Critical Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. II., by C. H. TOY (Review), 770.
 Cheyney, E. P., 427.
 CHEYNEY, E. P., *The End of Villainage in England*, by Thomas W. Page (Review), 355; *England under the Protector Somerset*, by A. F. POLLARD (Review), 553; *Serfs et Vilains au Moyen Age*, par Henri Doniol (Review), 355; *The Sources and Literature of English History from the Earliest Times to about 1485*, by Charles Gross (Review), 540; *Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects*, by W. Cunningham (Review), 774.
 Chiamonti, Cardinal, 645.
Christianity in the Apostolic Age, by George T. Purves, by SHAILER MATHEWS (Review), 539.
 Christie, Francis A., paper by, 416.
 CHRISTIE, FRANCIS A., *The Apostolic Age*, by James V. Bartlet (Review), 537.
 Christophle, M., Minister of Public Works, 766, 769.
 Christy, Miller, *The Silver Map of the World; A Geographical Essay*, by GEORGE PARKER WINSHIP (Review), 358.
 Cicero, 216.
Cicero, The Letters of, edited by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, by ALBERT GRANGER HARKNESS (Review), 607.
 Circular of the Union Party Committee of Correspondence for Charleston, 749.
Civil War, Military Reminiscences of the, by Gen. Jacob D. Cox, by H. V. BOYNTON (Review), 602.
Civil War in America, Numbers and Losses in the, 1861-1865, by Thomas L. Livermore (Review), 598.
 Clark, A. Howard, 414, 424, 427, 428.
 Clavière, the banker, 239-241.
 Clay, Henry, 23, 25, 26.
 Clayton, Henry D., 41.
Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, The History of the, by Ira B. Travis, by J. B. MOORE (Review), 150.
 Clement VIII., 445.
 Clement XII., 644, 645.
Clergy in American Life and Letters, The, by Daniel D. Addison, by BARRETT WENDELL (Review), 576.
 Cleveland, President, Boundary Commission of, 49.
 Clinton, De Witt, 448, 449, 452.
 Clinton, George, *Public Papers of*, III., edited by Hugh Hastings (Review), 391.
 Clové, Admiral, 483.
 Cobb, Howell, 472.
 Cochinchina, representation in, 496.
 Cochrane, Admiral Sir Alexander, 508; letters of, 521-524, 529, 530; letters to, 521-523; Capt. Thomas J., letter of, 521.
 Coffin, Victor, 416.
 COFFIN, VICTOR, *Daniel O'Connell and the Revival of National Life in Ireland*, by Robert Dunlop (Review), 567; *Kléber et Menou en Égypte depuis le Départ de Bonaparte*, edited by F. Rousseau (Review), 786; *Souvenirs Politiques du Comte de Salaberry sur la Restauration*, edited by the Comte de Salaberry (Review), 789.
 Coleman, William, 448, 449, 453.
Collection de Documents pour l'Histoire Religieuse et Littéraire du Moyen Age, Tmes I. et II., edited by Paul Sabatier (Review), 544.
Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, seventh series, Vol. I. (Review), 842.
Collections of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Vol. XV. (Review), 613.

- Collier, Adelaide D'A. (editor), *Despatches and Correspondence of John, Second Earl of Buckinghamshire* (Review), 387.
- COLLINS, EDWARD D., *The American Slave-Trade*, by John R. Spears (Review), 586.
- Collins, E. K., 463, 464.
- Colonial Times on Buzzard's Bay*, by William R. Bliss (Review), 391.
- Colonies, English Common Law in the Early American*, by Paul S. Reinsch, by W. M. WEST (Review), 584.
- Colonization, The History of, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, by Henry C. Morris, by CLIVE DAY (Review), 533.
- Columbia, S. C., 736.
- Columbus, Christopher, 200-202; third voyage of, 672.
- Columbus, Ga., 40, 41.
- Commercial Advertiser*, the, 448, 453.
- Communipaw, 5.
- Compromise tariff of 1833, the, 25.
- Connecticut, the colony of, 15, 16, 694, 695, 703, 704, 707; public land question in, 23.
- Conseil Supérieur des Colonies*, the, 492.
- Constantinople, capture of, 254, 255.
- Constitution, The Frigate*, by Ira N. Hollis, by H. C. TAYLOR (Review), 820.
- Constitutional History of South Carolina*, by D. D. Wallace, by W. ROY SMITH (Review), 175.
- Conversion des Sauvages*, 688-690.
- Coolidge, Archibald C., 415.
- COOLIDGE, ARCHIBALD CARY, *Russia and the Russians*, by Edmund Noble (Review), 791.
- Cooper, Dr. Thomas, Letters of, 1825-1832* (Documents), 725.
- Cooper, Mehetabel, 301; William, 301.
- Cooper, Samuel, Diary of, 1775-1776*, with Introduction by FREDERICK TUCKERMAN (Document), 301.
- CORBETT, JULIAN S., *Histoire de la Marine Française*, Vol. II., *La Guerre de Cent Ans; Révolution Maritime*, par Charles de la Roncière (Review), 546.
- Corbett, Julian S., *The Successors of Drake*, by W. F. TILTON (Review), 551.
- Corey, Deloraine P., *History of Malden, Mass.*, by HENRY H. EDES (Review), 175.
- Correspondance de Le Coz, Evêque Constitutionnel d' Ille-et-Vilaine*, par le P. Roussel, by CHARLES L. WELLS (Review), 133.
- Corsini, Cardinal, 645.
- Coues, Elliott, *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer; The Diary and Itinerary of Francisco Garcés*, by FRANK W. BLACKMAR (Review), 141.
- Council of Constance to the Death of John Hus, The*, by James H. Wylie, by GEORGE LINCOLN BURR (Review), 548.
- County Palatine of Durham, The*, by Gailard T. Lapsley, by MELVILLE M. BIGELOW (Review), 123.
- Courier and Enquirer*, the, 452-459, 463, 464.
- Covington, Ga., 473.
- Cox, General Jacob D. (deceased), 182, 472.
- Cox, Gen. Jacob D., *Military Reminiscences of the Civil War*, by H. V. BOYNTON (Review), 602.
- Cradle of the Republic, The; Jamestown and James River*, by Lyon G. Tyler (Review), 391.
- Crawford, Indian Commissioner, 283.
- Creighton, the Right Rev. Dr. Mandell, Bishop of London (deceased), 615.
- Critical Examination of Irish History, A*, by T. Dunbar Ingram, by RALPH C. H. CATTERALL (Review), 779.
- Critical Study of Nullification in South Carolina*, by Houston, 737.
- Cromwell, Oliver*, by John Morley, by GUERNSEY JONES (Review), 652.
- Cromwell, Oliver*, by Theodore Roosevelt, by GUERNSEY JONES (Review), 562.
- Cromwell's Foreign Relations, The Protestant Interest in*, by Jacob N. Bowman, by GUERNSEY JONES (Review), 837.
- Croswell, Edwin, 449-451, 459.
- Cruger, John, 274.
- Cruikshank, Col. E. (editor), *The Documentary History of the Campaign upon the Niagara Frontier in 1812* (Review), 845.
- Crusades, The Year 1000 and the Antecedents of the*, by GEORGE LINCOLN BURR, 429.
- Cuba, bill for the purchase of, 33; the coasts of, 672; the Spaniards in, 679.
- Cuba, Under Three Flags in*, by George C. Musgrave, by THEODORE A. DODGE, (Review), 179.

- Cumaná, 52.
 Cunningham, W., *Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects*, by E. P. CHEYNEY (Review), 774.
 Curumo, colony on the river, 63.
 Cuyuni, colony on the river, 54, 57, 61-63.
 Dacres, Admiral James R., letters of, 528; letters to, 525-527.
 Dahn, Felix, 431.
Daily Advertiser, the, 447.
Daily Astorian, the, 284.
Daily Minerva, the, 448.
 Dana, James Dwight, *The Life of*, by Daniel C. Gilman (Review), 844.
Daniel O'Connell and the Revival of National Life in Ireland, by Robert Dunlop, by VICTOR COFFIN (Review), 567.
 Darwin, Charles, quotation from, 197, 199, 211.
 D'Avenel, le Vicomte G., *La Noblesse Française sous Richelieu*, by JAMES BRECK PERKINS (Review), 781.
 Davis, Andrew McF., 416; Jefferson, 467, 471; Matthew L., 449.
 Davis, Richard H., *With Both Armies in South Africa*, by THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE (Review), 611.
 DAWSON, S. E., *Cabot Bibliography, with an Introductory Essay on the Careers of the Cabots*, by George P. Winship (Review), 574.
 Day, Benjamin H., 457, 458.
 DAY, CLIVE, *The History of Colonization from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, by Henry C. Morris (Review), 533.
 Dean, Sarah M., 428.
 De Berton, John, 659.
 Debidour, A., *Histoire des Rapports de l'Église et de l'État en France de 1789 à 1870*, by CHARLES L. WELLS (Review), 362.
 Debow, J. B., 47.
 De Canynge, John, 664, 665, 667.
Decatur, Stephen, by Cyrus T. Brady (Review), 389.
 Decazes, Duc, Minister of Foreign Affairs, 766.
Decline and Fall, Gibbon's, 226, 227.
De Courtot, Memoirs of the Baroness Cécile, compiled by Moritz von Kaisenberg, by CHARLES D. HAZEN (Review), 130.
 Decrais, Minister of Colonies, 488.
 De Draughton, Thomas, 662, 663.
 De Fijn, J., letter of, 57, 59.
 De Forest, J. W., *The De Forests of Avesnes*, by HENRY M. BAIRD (Review), 844.
De Forests of Avesnes, The, by J. W. De Forest, by HENRY M. BAIRD (Review), 844.
 De Garford, Robert, 667.
 De Gonneville, voyage of, 671.
 De la Becke, Edmund, 665.
 De Lancey family, the, 262, 263, 274; James, 274.
 De la Roche, Jean François, 682, 683, 688.
 Delaware, colonial settlements in, 695; Dutch settlements on the, 15; public land question in, 22.
 Delaware Bay, 694.
 Delaware river, the, 694, 695, 697, 719, 721-724.
 Delaware territories, the, 717-724.
 Delfico, Melchiorre, 635, 638, 647.
 Delle Rovere, Francesco Maria, 640.
 Deltone, bishop of Rimini, 635.
 Demerara, the, 54.
 De Monts, voyage of, 671, 674, 676, 677, 683, 686, 688.
 Demosthenes, 216.
 Deniker, J., *The Races of Man*, by WILLIAM Z. RIPLEY (Review), 110.
 Denis, voyage of, 671.
 Dennis, Alfred L. P., 415.
 DENNIS, ALFRED L. P., *Eighteen Years in the Khyber, 1879-1898*, by Sir Robert Warburton (Review), 569; *The Forward Policy and Its Results*, by Richard I. Bruce (Review), 569.
 De Peyster family, the, 262.
 De Poutrincourt, voyage of, 674, 676.
 Deproge, representative from Martinique, 484, 486.
 Derby, Lord, 494-496.
 De Roo, P., *History of America Before Columbus, according to Documents and Approved Authors*, by H. W. H. (Review), 799.
 De Salazar, Jeanne, 675.
 Des Forests, Jesse, 53.
 De Smedt's *Indian Sketches*, 292.
Despatches and Correspondence of John, Second Earl of Buckinghamshire, Ambassador to the Court of Catherine II.

- edited by Adelaide D'A. Collier (Review), 387.
- D'Estournelles de Constant, 496.
- De Wallingford, Richard, 656-658.
- DEWEY, DAVIS RICH, *Essays on the Monetary History of the United States*, by Charles J. Bullock (Review), 579; *A History of Banking in the United States*, by John Jay Knox (Review), 377.
- Diary of John Harrower, 1773-1776* (Documents), 65.
- Diary of Samuel Cooper, 1775-1776*, with Introduction by FREDERICK TUCKERMAN (Document), 301.
- Dickerson, Mahlon, 725.
- Diderot, 245.
- Dionysius, the monk, 436, 437.
- Diplomacy, A Trial Bibliography of American*, by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, 848-866.
- Diplomatic Relations, The, of the United States and Spanish America*, by John H. Latané (Review), 146.
- Dislère, Minister, 496.
- Dissenters, The Society of*, with introduction by HERBERT L. OSGOOD (Documents), 498.
- Documentary History, The, of the Campaign upon the Niagara Frontier in 1812*, edited by Col. E. Cruikshank (Review), 845.
- DODGE, THEODORE AYRAULT, *Napoleon's Invasion of Russia*, by Hereford B. George (Review), 136; *Napoleon: The Last Phase*, by Lord Rosebery (Review), 565; *Under Three Flags in Cuba*, by George C. Musgrave (Review), 179; *With Both Armies in South Africa*, by Richard H. Davis (Review), 611.
- Dohm, Minister von, 244.
- Domesday record, the, 652, 654.
- Donelson, I. B., U. S. marshal, 45.
- Dongan, Governor, of N. Y., 701, 702.
- Doniol, Henri, *Serfs et Vilains au Moyen Age*, by E. P. CHEYNEY (Review), 355.
- Douglas, Stephen A., 28, 33.
- Douglas county, Kan., 45, 46.
- Doumer, Governor-general, 496.
- Dover, History of*, by S. P. H. Statham (Review), 169.
- Dow, Earle W., 414.
- Downfall of Spain, The: Naval History of the Spanish-American War*, by H. W. Wilson, by H. C. TAYLOR (Review), 159.
- Drake, Joseph Rodman, 453.
- Drake, Samuel A., *Old Landmarks and Historic Personages of Boston* (Review), 391.
- Dreux, the battle of, 675.
- Duane, family, the, 262.
- Duane, of the *Aurora*, 448.
- Du Bois, W. E. Burghardt, *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study* (Review), 162.
- Duclerc, Minister, 496.
- Dufaure, prime minister of France, 765-769.
- DUKE, BASIL W., *The Mississippi Valley in the Civil War*, by John Fiske (Review), 599.
- "Duke's Laws," the, 697, 704-720, 722.
- Duncan, Adam*, by H. W. Wilson (Review), 388.
- Dunlop, Robert, *Daniel O'Connell and the Revival of National Life in Ireland*, by VICTOR COFFIN (Review), 567.
- Dunning, William A., 427; remarks by, 422.
- Dunstable, rising of the burgesses of, 668.
- Duquesnay, deputy from Martinique, 486, 490.
- Durham, The County Palatine of*, by Gaillard T. Lapsley, by MELVILLE M. BIGELOW (Review), 123.
- Durkee, Charles, 209.
- Dutchess County, 261.
- Dutch West India Company, the, in South America, 51, 55, 56, 61.
- Dye, Eva E., *McLoughlin and Old Oregon*, by FRANCES F. VICTOR (Review), 148.
- EARLE, ALICE MORSE, *Stage-Coach and Tavern Days*, by WILLIAM B. WEEDEN (Review), 580.
- EDES, HENRY H., *History of Malden, Mass.*, by Deloraine P. Corey (Review), 175.
- Edmundson, Rev. George, article on Sweden's claims in South America by, 61.
- Education in the United States*, edited by Nicholas M. Butler (Review), 393.
- Edward II., 651.

- Edward III., 651, 655, 660-662, 666, 667.
- Edward the Third, The History of*, by James Mackinnon, by OLIVER H. RICHARDSON (Review), 125.
- Eells, Cushing, 279-281, 284, 285.
- Eggleston, Dr. Edward, 414, 417.
- Eggleston, Edward, *The Transit of Civilization from England to America in the Seventeenth Century*, by BARRETT WENDELL (Review), 802.
- Egle, Dr. W. H. (deceased), 869.
- Eicken, Heinrich von, 434, 435.
- Eighteen Years in the Khyber, 1879-1898*, by Col. Sir Robert Warburton, by ALFRED L. P. DENNIS (Review), 569.
- Elizabeth, Queen, 256.
- Ely, Richard T., 423; address by, 417.
- Emigrant Aid Societies, 38-41.
- Encyclopaedia Biblica: A Critical Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. II., edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black, by C. H. TOY (Review), 770.
- England, A History of, for the Use of Schools and Academies*, by J. N. Larned and Homer P. Lewis, by GERTRUDE S. KIMBALL (Review), 348.
- England, discovery and colonization, by 671, 673; the municipal history of, 650, 669, 670; town and county government in, 698-701, 703, 706, 714; trading privileges of, in Turkey, 256-259.
- England, The End of Villainage in*, by Thomas W. Page, by E. P. CHEYNEY (Review), 355.
- England under the Protector Somerset*, by A. F. Pollard, by E. P. CHEYNEY (Review), 553.
- English and Dutch Towns, The, of New Netherland*, by ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, 1.
- English Church during the Civil Wars and Commonwealth, A History of the*, by William A. Shaw, by W. DAWSON JOHNSTON (Review), 128.
- English Common Law in the Early American Colonies*, by Paul S. Reinsch, by W. M. WEST (Review), 584.
- English History, Side Lights on*, by Ernest F. Henderson, by W. DAWSON JOHNSTON (Review), 168.
- English History, Source-Book of*, edited by Elizabeth K. Kendall (Review), 383.
- English History, Source-Book of*, by Guy C. Lee (Review), 384.
- English History, The Sources and Literature of, from the Earliest Times to about 1485*, by Charles Gross, by EDWARD P. CHEYNEY (Review), 540.
- English Political Philosophy from Hobbes to Maine*, by William Graham, by JAMES H. TUFTS (Review), 360.
- Erdmannsdörffer, Bernhard (deceased), 868.
- Ernst, the Archduke, 647.
- Eronnelle, P., translation of Lescarbot by, 687.
- Esopus river, settlements on the, 717-719.
- Essai sur les Illuminés*, 241.
- Essai sur le Système de Politique Étrangère de J. J. Rousseau*, par J. L. Windenberger, by C. E. MERRIAM (Review), 385.
- Essays on the Monetary History of the United States*, by Charles J. Bullock, by DAVIS RICH DEWEY (Review), 579.
- Essequibo river, the, 51-55, 57, 59-61.
- Este, Anne of, 675; Hercules of, 675.
- Esterno, French ambassador at Berlin, 241, 248.
- Étude sur l'Histoire Économique de la France (1760-1789)*, par Camille Bloch, by HENRY E. BOURNE (Review), 784.
- Eufaula, Ala., 39-41.
- Eugippius, the monk, 634.
- Europe, Modern, Historical Atlas of*, edited by R. L. Poole, Parts XXVI., XXVII., (Reviews), 164, 383.
- Evening Post*, the, 448, 452, 453, 463, 465.
- EVERETT, WALTER GOODNOW, *Outlines of the History of Religion*, by John K. Ingram (Review), 165; *Primitive Love and Love-Stories*, by Henry T. Finck (Review), 108.
- Ewart, secretary of the British legation at Berlin, 244, 250, 251.
- Expansion, The, of the American People, Social and Territorial*, by Edwin E. Sparks, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 805.
- Faetano, castle of, 639.
- Fain, U. S. dep.-marshal, 45.
- Farnham, Charles H., *A Life of Francis Parkman*, by BARRETT WENDELL (Review), 376.
- Farnham's *Travels in Oregon*, 289, 290.
- Farrand, Max, 427.

- Farwell, Governor, of Wis., 29.
 Fattori, historian of San Marino, 639-641.
 Faversham (Kent), rising in, 668.
 Federalism in the United States, 203.
 Ferdinand II. of Austria, 646.
 FIELD, EDWARD, *Paul Jones, Founder of the American Navy*, by Augustus C. Buell (Review), 589.
 Finck, Henry T., *Primitive Love and Love-Stories*, by WALTER G. EVERETT (Review), 108.
 Finley, John H., remarks by, 419.
 Firth, Charles H. (editor), *The Narrative of General Venables* (Review), 385.
 Fisher, George P., 427.
 Fiske, John, 230.
 Fiske, John, *The Mississippi Valley in the Civil War*, by BASIL W. DUKE (Review), 599.
Fithian, Philip Vickers: Journal and Letters, edited by J. Rogers Williams (Review), 613.
 FLEMING, WALTER L., *The Buford Expedition to Kansas*, 38.
 Fling, F. M., 428.
 Florence, 641, 648.
 Florida, expedition to, 674.
 "Florida Donation Act" of 1842, the, 26.
 Flushing (Vlissingen), L. I., 10, 716.
 Fodéré, Pradier, 255.
 Fort de France, 485, 490.
 Fort Hall, 296.
 Fort Orange, 1.
 Fort Walla Walla, 277, 280, 282, 293, 297, 300.
 Forti, Francesco, 431.
Forward Policy and its Results, The, by Richard I. Bruce, by ALFRED L. P. DENNIS (Review), 569.
 Foster, John W., *A Century of American Diplomacy*, by JOHN HOLLADAY LATTANÉ (Review), 587.
 Foster, Roger, 427.
 Foster, William E., 428.
 Fourichon, Vice-Admiral, Minister of Marine, 766.
 France, the communes of, 668, 669; in discovery and colonization, 671, 673; trading privileges of, in Turkey, 256-258.
 France, *Études sur l'Histoire Économique de la (1760-1789)*, par Camille Bloch, by HENRY E. BOURNE (Review), 784.
 France, *A Ministerial Crisis in, 1876*, with introduction by THEODORE STANTON (Document), 765.
 France de 1789 à 1870, *Histoire des Rapports de l'Église et de l'État en*, par A. Debidour, by CHARLES L. WELLS (Review), 362.
 Francis I., 201, 255, 675, 680.
 François, village of, 487, 490.
 Franklin, Kan., 44, 45, 47.
Fratrisc Francisci Bartholdi de Assisio Tractatus de Indulgentia S. Mariae de Portiuncula, edited by Paul Sabatier (Review), 544.
 Frazer, J. G., *Pausanias and Other Greek Sketches* (Review), 382.
Freak of Freedom, by J. T. Bent, 633.
 Frederic II., of Prussia, 201.
 Frederick William, of Prussia, 243, 244, 246, 248-252.
 Free-Soil party, public land policy of, 28, 31.
 French Experience with Representative Government in the West Indies, by PAUL S. REINSCH, 475.
 French Hakluyt, *The*; Marc Lescarbot of Vervins, by H. P. BIGGAR, 671.
 French India, representation in, 496.
 French Monarchy, *The, 1483-1789*, by A. J. Grant (Review), 836.
 Freneau, Philip, 447.
 Freycinet government, the, 492.
 Friederici, Georg, *Indianer und Anglo-Amerikaner*, by JAMES MOONEY (Review), 172.
Frigate Constitution, The, the Central Figure of the Navy under Sail, by Ira N. Hollis, by H. C. TAYLOR (Review), 820.
 Froidevaux, Henri, article on the Venezuelan controversy by, 60.
 Froude, J. A., 217, 218, 230.
 Fugitive Slave Law, the, 209.
 Fundy, the Bay of, 675, 676.
 Gadsden, Ala., 466.
 Gaine's Mercury, 447.
 Gambetta, M., 767, 768.
 Garcés, Francisco, *The Diary and Itinerary of*, by Elliott Coues, by FRANK W. BLACKMAR (Review), 141.
 Garibaldi, 646, 647.
 Garrett, William R., *History of Tennessee, its People and its Institutions*, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 380.
 Garriga, Benito de la, 62.
 Garrison, William Lloyd, 204-206.

- Gaul, Caesar's Conquest of*, by T. Rice Holmes (Review), 115.
- Gautier, Léon, 434.
- Gaylesville, Ala., 466.
- Genoa, trade of, in Turkey, 256, 257.
- George, Hereford B., *Napoleon's Invasion of Russia*, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 136.
- Georges, Samuel, 688.
- Georgia, the Kansas question in, 39-42; Sherman's March through, 466-474.
- Gerberga, Queen, 432.
- Gerbert, 431-433, 438.
- German and Swiss Settlements, The, of Colonial Pennsylvania*, by Oscar Kuhns, by M. D. LEARNED (Review), 813.
- Germans in Colonial Times, The*, by Lucy F. Bittinger, by M. D. LEARNED (Review), 813.
- "German Union," the, 243, 244.
- Germany, the towns of, 669; trade of, with Turkey, 258.
- Gerry, Elbridge T., 416.
- Gerson, 441, 442.
- Gervais, Nicolas, Bishop of Oran, 60.
- Ghibellines, the, in Italy, 636.
- Giangi, Captain of San Marino, 644.
- Gibbon, Edward, 215-217, 219, 222, 230; *Memoirs of*, 226.
- Gilman, Daniel C., *The Life of James Dwight Dana* (Review), 844.
- Giry, Arthur, 436.
- Globe*, Washington, the, 286, 450.
- Gloucester, Humphrey, Duke of, 442.
- Godel, William, 432.
- Godellus, chronicle of, 431.
- Godfrey of Bouillon, 429.
- Goldsmith, Oliver, 214.
- Gordon, Captain, 43.
- Gordon, Lina Duff, *The Story of Assisi*, by FERDINAND SCHWILL (Review), 608.
- Gourgues, expedition of, 678, 689.
- Gozi, Captain of San Marino, 643.
- Graham, Sylvester, 452.
- Graham, William, *English Political Philosophy from Hobbes to Maine*, by JAMES H. TUFTS (Review), 360.
- Grand Island, 456.
- "Grand Orient" of France, 242, 247.
- Grant, A. J., *The French Monarchy, 1483-1789* (Review), 836.
- Grant, Ulysses S., 213, 466-469.
- Grant, Ulysses S.*, by Owen Wister (Review), 823.
- Grasset, Admiral, 481.
- Gravesend, 9-11, 13.
- Gray, William H., 278, 280, 281, 283-285, 290, 294; his *History of Oregon*, 284.
- Great Britain, 648; and the Guiana boundary, 49-64; slavery in, 202.
- Greece, A History of, to the Death of Alexander the Great*, by J. B. Bury, by G. W. B. (Review), 345.
- Greece, A History of, Part III.*, by Evelyn Abbott, by G. W. B. (Review), 346.
- Greeley, Gen. A. W., 424, 427.
- Greeley, Horace, 289, 290, 455-458.
- Green, John Henry, 217, 218, 230.
- Greenhow's *History of Oregon*, 286, 289.
- Gregory VII., 439.
- Gregory XII., 638.
- Gregory of Tours, 436.
- Griffin, A. P. C., 428.
- Griffis, William E., *Verbeck of Japan, A Citizen of no Country*, by C. MERIWETHER (Review), 829.
- Grimoaldi, Cardinal Anglicus, 638.
- Gross, Charles, 428.
- GROSS, CHARLES, *The Political Influence of the University of Paris in the Middle Ages*, 440.
- Gross, Charles, *The Sources and Literature of English History from the Earliest Times to about 1485*, by EDWARD P. CHEYNEY (Review), 540.
- Grote, George, 217.
- Guadeloupe, political conditions in, 477-483, 491-494.
- Guelphs, the, in Italy, 636.
- Guiana, The Dutch in, 51-63; French political conditions in, 476-480, 491, 494; the Spaniards in, 51-63.
- Guiana Boundary, The*, by GEORGE LINCOLN BURR, 49.
- Guibert, deputy, from Martinique, 486.
- Guienne, Duke of (1413), 441, 442.
- Gunter, Clement, 58.
- H., H. W., *History of America before Columbus, according to Documents and Approved Authors*, by P. de Roo (Review), 799.
- Hakluyt's collection, 673, 674, 675, 678.
- Hale and Hallock, proprietors of the *Journal of Commerce*, 455.
- Hall, Bolling, letters by, 736; Hubert, 508.
- Hallam, Henry, 217.

- Halleck, Fitz Greene, 453; General, 467, 470, 472.
- Hamilton, Alexander, 448; James, Jr., 725, 736; James, Jr., letters by, 738, 740, 741, 745, 746, 748.
- Hamilton, Stanislaus Murray (editor), *The Writings of James Monroe*, Vol. III., (Review), 368; Vol. IV. (Review), 596.
- Hammond, Edward Spann, 736; James H., 736; James H., letters by, 751, 755, 759, 761, 762; letters to, 737-741, 745-748, 760, 764; memorandum by, 741.
- Hanau, Count of, a grant in Guiana to, 61.
- Hansen, Joseph, *Zauberwahn, Inquisitionen und Hexenprozess im Mittelalter und die Entstehung der grossen Hexenverfolgung*, by G. L. B. (Review), 609.
- Hardee, General, 474.
- Harding, Samuel B., paper by, 420.
- Harebone, William, 256.
- Harriot, Thomas, *the Mathematician, the Philosopher, and the Scholar*, by Henry Stevens, by C. S. PEIRCE (Review), 557.
- HARKNESS, ALBERT GRANGER, *The Letters of Cicero*, edited by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh (Review), 607.
- Harlem, N. Y., 697, 699.
- Harrison, Frederic (quoted), 226.
- Harrower, John, *Diary of, 1773-1776* (Documents), 65.
- Hart, Albert B., 422-426.
- Hart, Albert B. (editor), *American History told by Contemporaries*, Vol. III. (Review), 590.
- HART, ALBERT BUSHNELL, *A Trial Bibliography of American Diplomacy*, 848-866.
- Hartford Convention, the, 203.
- Harttung, Julius, 438.
- Haskins, Charles H., 418, 423, 427.
- HASKINS, CHARLES H., *Histoire de l'Inquisition au Moyen-Age*, by Henry C. Lea, translated by Salomon Reinach (Review), 834; *A History of Spain*, by Ulick R. Burke, edited by Martin A. S. Hume (Review), 167; *Manuel de Bibliographie Historique*, by C. V. Langlois (Review), 831; *Trattati Medievali di Rithmica Latina*, by Giovanni Mari, 835.
- Hastings, Hugh (editor), *Public Papers of George Clinton* (Review), 391.
- Havana, 672, 673.
- Havet, Julien, 438.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel, 214.
- Hayne, Robert Y., 213, 725, 736; letters by, 737, 738, 747, 752, 758, 760, 764; letters to, 751, 759, 761; public land policy of, 24; Wm. E., letter by, 760, 764; letter to, 762.
- HAYNES, GEORGE H., *Thomas Jefferson*, by Thomas E. Watson (Review), 842.
- Hayti, political conditions in, 476.
- HAZEN, CHARLES D., *Memoirs of the Baroness Cécile de Courtot*, compiled by Moritz von Kaisenberg (Review), 130.
- Hazlitt, W. Carew, *The Venetian Republic: Its Rise, its Growth and its Fall, 421-1797*, by WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER (Review), 353.
- Hearn, Lafcadio, 485.
- Heathcote, Caleb, 261; the family, 261, 262; George, 261.
- Hebrews, Life and Literature of the Ancient*, by Lyman Abbott, by C. H. TOY (Review), 772.
- Hempstead, L. I., 10, 13, 704, 715.
- Henderson, E. F., 428.
- Henderson, Ernest F., *Side Lights on English History*, by W. DAWSON JOHNSTON (Review), 168.
- Henlopen, Cape, 720.
- Henry II., charter of, 654; of France, 675.
- Henry IV. of France, 675.
- Henry V. of England, 442.
- Henry VIII., 201.
- Henry of Prussia, Prince, 235, 244, 250.
- Henry, William Wirt (deceased), 616.
- Herald*, the, 454, 457, 460-465.
- Herald of Freedom*, the, 45.
- Herodotus, 212, 215, 216, 230.
- Herschel, Sir John, 457.
- Hertfordshire, 651, 653.
- Hildreth, Richard, 220.
- Hilliard, Henry W., 41, 43.
- HINSDALE, B. A., *The Northwest under Three Flags*, by Charles Moore (Review), 139.
- Hinsdale, Professor Burke A. (deceased), 395.
- Hislop, Governor, of Trinidad, 508.
- Histoire de l'Inquisition au Moyen-Age*, by Henry C. Lea, translated by Salomon Reinach, by CHARLES H. HASKINS (Review), 834.

- Histoire de la Marine Française*, Vol. II., *La Guerre de Cent Ans; Révolution Maritime*, par Charles de la Roncière, by JULIAN S. CORBETT (Review), 546.
- Histoire des Rapports de l'Église et de l'État en France de 1789 à 1870*, par A. Debidour, by CHARLES L. WELLS (Review), 362.
- Historic Towns of the Southern States*, edited by Lyman P. Powell, by B. J. RAMAGE (Review), 824.
- Historical Atlas of Modern Europe*, Part XXVI., edited by R. L. Poole (Review), 164; Part XXVII. (Review), 383.
- Historical Jurisprudence: An Introduction to the Systematic Study of the Development of Law*, by Guy C. Lee, by JOSEPH H. BEALE, JR. (Review), 531.
- History of America before Columbus, according to Documents and Approved Authors*, by P. de Roo, by H. W. H. (Review), 799.
- History of Banking in the United States*, by John Jay Knox, by DAVIS RICH. DEWEY (Review), 377.
- History of the Castle, Town and Port of Dover*, by S. P. H. Statham (Review), 169.
- History of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, The*, by Ira D. Travis, by J. B. MOORE (Review), 150.
- History of Colonization, The, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, by Henry C. Morris, by CLIVE DAY (Review), 533.
- History of Edward the Third, The*, by James Mackinnon, by OLIVER H. RICHARDSON (Review), 125.
- History of England, A, for the Use of Schools and Academies*, by J. N. Larned, with Analyses, etc., by Homer P. Lewis, by GERTRUDE S. KIMBALL (Review), 348.
- History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and Commonwealth*, by William A. Shaw, by W. DAWSON JOHNSTON (Review), 128.
- History and General Description of New France*, Vol. I., by F. X. de Charlevoix, edited by John G. Shea (Review), 811.
- History of Greece, A, to the Death of Alexander the Great*, by J. B. Bury, by G. W. B. (Review), 345.
- History of Greece, A*, Part III., by Evelyn Abbott, by G. W. B. (Review), 346.
- History of the Jewish People during the Maccabean and Roman Times*, by James S. Riggs (Review), 166.
- History of Malden, Mass.*, by Deloraine P. Corey, by HENRY H. EDES (Review), 175.
- History of My Own Time*, by Bishop Burnett, edited by Dr. Osmund Airy, Vol. II., (Review), 169.
- History of the New World called America*, Vol. II., by Edward J. Payne, by FRANK RUSSELL (Review), 796.
- History, A, of the People of the United States from the Revolution to the Civil War*, Vol. V., by John Bach McMaster, by CHARLES H. LEVERMORE (Review), 370.
- History of Political Parties in the United States, A*, Vol. I., by J. P. Gordy, by WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN (Review), 592.
- History of Political Parties in the United States, A*, by James H. Hopkins, by WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN (Review), 592.
- History of Scotland from the Roman Occupation, I.*, by Andrew Lang, by GAILLARD T. LAPSLEY (Review), 121.
- History of Spain, A*, by Ulick R. Burke, edited by Martin A. S. Hume, by CHARLES H. HASKINS (Review), 167.
- History of Tennessee, its People and its Institutions*, by William R. Garrett, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 380.
- History, A, of Tennessee from 1663 to 1900 for Use in Schools*, by G. R. McGee, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 380.
- Hitchcock, Ripley, 420.
- Hixon, Joseph Sayer, 302.
- Hoar, Hon. George F., 427.
- Hodder, Frank H., paper by, 420.
- Holland, situation of, in 1786, 246, 250, 251.
- Hollander, Dr. J. H., 419.
- Hollis, Ira N., *The Frigate Constitution*, by H. C. TAYLOR (Review), 820.
- Holls, Frederick W., *The Peace Conference at the Hague*, by GEORGE L. RIVES (Review), 572.
- Holm, Professor Adolf (deceased), 182.

- Holmes, T. Rice, *Cæsar's Conquest of Gaul* (Review), 115.
- Holt, John, 447.
- Holt's *Journal*, 447.
- Homestead Legislation, Some Political Aspects of*, by JOHN BELL SANBORN, 19.
- Honfleur, 685.
- Hood, General, 466-468.
- Hopkins, James H., *A History of Political Parties in the United States*, by WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN (Review), 592.
- Horridge, Frank, *Lives of Great Italians* (Review), 835.
- Howard, G. E., 428.
- HOWARD, GEORGE ELLIOTT, *A Study of the Court of Star Chamber*, by Cora L. Scofield (Review), 775.
- Howe, Daniel W., *The Puritan Republic of the Massachusetts Bay in New England*, by WILLIAM B. WEEDEN (Review), 138.
- Hoyt, Jesse, 449, 459.
- Hudson, Dutch settlements on the, 15; the river, 261, 262, 694, 695, 697, 700, 717-719, 723.
- Hudson's Bay Company in Oregon, 277, 278, 280, 282, 284, 297, 298.
- Hugh of Everisdene, 655, 656.
- Hughes, Bishop, 461.
- Hull, Charles H., 419.
- HULL, CHARLES H., *Surveys Historic and Economic*, by W. J. Ashley (Review), 793.
- Hume, David, 214, 217, 225, 226.
- Hume, Martin A. S. (editor), *A History of Spain*, by Ulick R. Burke, by CHARLES H. HASKINS (Review), 167.
- Hunter, R. M. T., 47.
- HUNTINGTON, WILLIAM EDWARDS, *Wesley and Methodism*, by F. J. Snell (Review), 783.
- Hurard, deputy from Martinique, 484, 486, 490-492.
- Hutchinson, Governor, 301.
- Ignatian Epistles, Date of the (paper), 416.
- Il Belluzzi*, by Zuccoli, 642.
- Iles, George, 428.
- Illinois, 211; the election of 1848 in, 209; the Kansas question in, 42; public lands in, 28, 30.
- Illinois History, Chapters from*, by Edward G. Mason, by EDWIN ERLE SPARKS (Review), 825.
- Illuminés, the, 241-244, 247, 252.
- Illustrated Penny Magazine*, the, 456.
- Inciarte, diary of Commissioner, 58, 63.
- Indianer und Anglo-Amerikaner*, von Georg Friederici, by JAMES MOONEY (Review), 172.
- Indo-China, the government of, 496.
- Ingersoll, C. J., 232.
- Ingram, John K., *Outlines of the History of Religion*, by WALTER G. EVERETT (Review), 165.
- Ingram, T. Dunbar, *A Critical Examination of Irish History*, by RALPH C. H. CATTERALL (Review), 779.
- Innocent VI., 637.
- Iowa, the election of 1848 in, 209.
- Irish History, A Critical Examination of*, by T. Dunbar Ingram, by RALPH C. H. CATTERALL (Review), 779.
- "Iron Brigade," the, 210.
- Irving, Dr., editor of the *Morning Chronicle*, 448, 449; Washington, 220.
- Isaac, Senator, from Guadeloupe, 492, 493.
- Italian Influences*, by Eugene Schuyler, by WILLIAM R. THAYER (Review), 838.
- Iturriaga, the Spanish Commandant, 61, 62.
- Jackson, Andrew, 21, 23-25, 452, 458, 459, 736.
- Jackson, Rear-Admiral T. Sturges (editor), *Logs of the Great Sea-Fights, 1794-1805*, Vol. II. (Review), 610.
- Jackson, Rev. Samuel M., 416, 417, 427.
- Jähns, Lieut-Colonel Max (deceased), 396.
- Jamaica, political conditions in, 494-496.
- Jamaica (Rustdorp), L. I., 14.
- James, Duke of York, (James II.), 693, 694, 696-698, 701, 702, 704, 708, 713, 717.
- Jameson, J. Franklin, 424, 427.
- Jamestown and James River, The Cradle of the Republic*, by Lyon G. Tyler (Review), 391.
- Jauncey, James, 274.
- Jauréguiberry, Admiral, 482, 483.
- Jefferson, Thomas, 203, 204, 448, 450.
- Jefferson, Thomas*, by Thomas E. Watson, by GEORGE H. HAYNES (Review), 842.
- Jefferson Papers*, Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll. (Review), 843.
- Jernigan, Captain, 43, 47.
- Jewish People, A History of the, during the Maccabean and Roman Periods*, by James S. Riggs (Review), 166.
- Joan of Arc, 442.
- John XIII., Pope, 436.

- Johnson, Andrew, Senator from Tenn., 27, 30, 33, 35; Sir John, 268, 269; Sir William, 262, 266-270.
- Johnston, Henry P., *The Storming of Stony Point on the Hudson*, by JOHN BIGELOW, JR. (Review), 144.
- Johnston, L. F., 43, 47.
- JOHNSTON, R. M., *Mirabeau's Secret Mission to Berlin*, 235.
- JOHNSTON, W. DAWSON, *A History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and Commonwealth*, by William A. Shaw (Review), 128; *Side Lights on English History*, by Ernest F. Henderson (Review), 168.
- Johannot, Gabriel, 302.
- Jonas, the, 676, 677.
- Jones, David Brynmor, and John Rhys, *The Welsh People*, by F. N. ROBINSON (Review), 349.
- JONES, GUERNSEY, *Oliver Cromwell*, by John Morley (Review), 562; *Oliver Cromwell*, by Theodore Roosevelt (Review), 562; *The Protestant Interest in Cromwell's Foreign Relations*, by Jacob N. Bowman (Review), 837.
- Jones, John W., 43; Samuel J., 45, 46.
- Jones, Paul, *Founder of the American Navy*, by Augustus C. Buell, by EDWARD FIELD (Review), 589.
- Joseph II., policy of, 245, 246.
- Journal of Commerce*, the, 452-455, 463, 464.
- Judson, Harry Pratt, 414, 416.
- Julius II., 640.
- Juvenal, 216.
- Kaisenberg, Moritz von (editor), *Memoirs of the Baroness Cécile de Courtot*, by CHARLES D. HAZEN (Review), 130.
- Kansas, *The Buford Expedition to*, by WALTER L. FLEMING, 38.
- Kansas, Territory of, 38-48.
- Kansas City, 47.
- Kansas-Nebraska bill, the, 31, 38.
- Kendall, Elizabeth K. 427.
- Kendall, Elizabeth K. (editor), *Source-Book of English History* (Review), 383.
- KENT, CHARLES F., *A New Chapter in the Life of Thutmose III.*, by James H. Breasted (Review), 832.
- Kentucky, 202; public land question in, 20, 27, 30, 31.
- Kergist, Admiral, 481.
- Keymis, 52.
- Kieft, William, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18.
- Kijkoveral, fort at, 53.
- Kilpatrick, General, 473.
- KIMBALL, GERTRUDE S., *A History of England for the Use of Schools and Academies*, by J. N. Larned (Review), 348.
- King, Charles, 455.
- King's College, 498.
- Kingston, Jamaica, 495.
- Kléber et Menou en Égypte depuis le Départ de Bonaparte*, edited by F. Rousseau, by VICTOR COFFIN (Review), 786.
- Knight, Senator, from Martinique, 486.
- Know Nothing movement, the, 30, 36, 446.
- Knox, Henry*, by Noah Brooks, by OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD (Review), 367.
- Knox, John Jay, *A History of Banking in the United States*, by DAVIS RICH DEWEY (Review), 377.
- Kolonialpolitik, Die, Napoleons I.*, by Gustav Roloff (Review), 364.
- Kuhns, Oscar, *The German and Swiss Settlements of Colonial Pennsylvania*, by M. D. LEARNED (Review), 813.
- La Liberté de l'Escompte*, 239.
- Lancaster, Earl of, 652.
- Lane, W. C., 428.
- Lang, Andrew, *A History of Scotland from the Roman Occupation*, I., by GAILLARD T. LAPSLEY (Review), 121.
- Langlois, C. V., *Manuel de Bibliographie Historique*, by C. H. Haskins (Review), 831.
- La Noblesse Française sous Richelieu*, par le Vicomte G. d'Avenel, by JAMES BRECK PERKINS (Review), 781.
- Lapsley, Gaillard T., *The County Palatine of Durham*, by MELVILLE M. BIGELOW (Review), 123.
- LAPSLEY, GAILLARD T., *A History of Scotland from the Roman Occupation*, I., by Andrew Lang (Review), 121.
- Larned, J. N., 428.
- Larned, J. N., *A History of England for the Use of Schools and Academies*, by GERTRUDE S. KIMBALL (Review), 348.
- La Rochelle, 676, 688, 690, 691.
- Las Casas, narrative of, 679.
- La Société de Crédit Foncier Colonial*, 477.
- LATANÉ, JOHN HOLLADAY, *A Century of American Diplomacy*, by John W. Foster (Review), 587.

- Latané, John H., *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States and Spanish-America* (Review), 146.
- Laudonnière, voyages of, 671, 677, 678, 680, 685.
- Lauzun, Duc de, 240, 241, 247.
- Lawrence, Kan., 44-47.
- Lea, Henry C., *Histoire de l'Inquisition au Moyen-age*, translated by Salomon Reinach, by CHARLES H. HASKINS (Review), 834.
- LEARNED, M. D., *The German and Swiss Settlements of Colonial Pennsylvania*, by Oscar Kuhns (Review), 813; *The Germans in Colonial Time*, by Lucy F. Bittinger (Review), 813.
- Lecompton, Kan., 44-46.
- Le Coz, *Evêque Constitutionnel d'Ille-et-Vilaine, Correspondance de*, par le P. Roussel, by CHARLES L. WELLS (Review), 133.
- Ledger, the Philadelphia, 464.
- Lee, Guy C., *Historical Jurisprudence*, by JOSEPH H. BEALE, Jr. (Review), 531; *Source-Book of English History* (Review), 384.
- LEE, GUY C., *The Legal Protection of Woman among the Ancient Germans*, by William Rullkoetter (Review), 833.
- Legal Protection of Woman among the Ancient Germans, The*, by William Rullkoetter, by GUY C. LEE (Review), 833.
- Legend of Marcus Whitman, The*, by EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE, 276.
- Leggett, William, 453.
- Leo X., 641.
- Leo XII., 646.
- Lerma, Duke of, letter of the, 53.
- Leroy-Beaulieu, P., 496.
- Lery, Jean de, 679, 680, 685.
- Lescarbot, Marc, 674-692.
- Lescarbot, Marc, of Vervins; The French Hakluyt*, by H. P. BIGGAR, 671.
- Les Colonies*, 484, 486, 490.
- Les Muses de la Nouvelle France*, 686, 690.
- Letters of Cicero, The*, edited by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, by ALBERT GRANGER HARKNESS (Review), 607.
- Letters of Dr. Thomas Cooper, 1825-1832* (Documents), 725.
- Letters on the Nullification Movement in South Carolina, 1830-1834, I.* (Documents), 736.
- Lettre remise à Frédéric Guillaume II., Mirabeau's*, 249.
- Lettres de Madame Reinhard à sa Mère*, edited by the Baroness de Wimpffen, by FERDINAND SCHWILL (Review), 787.
- Levant, trade of the, 254, 255.
- Le Vasseur, annals of the church of Noyon, by, 431.
- LEVERMORE, CHARLES H., *A History of the People of the United States*, Vol. V., by John Bach McMaster (Review), 370; *The Rise of Metropolitan Journalism*, 446.
- Life, Unpublished Letters and Philosophical Regimen of Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury*, edited by Benjamin Rand, by JAMES H. TUFTS (Review), 609.
- Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews*, by Lyman Abbott, by C. H. TOY (Review), 772.
- Life of Francis Parkman, A*, by Charles H. Farnham, by BARRETT WENDELL (Review), 376.
- Life of James Dwight Dana, The*, by Daniel C. Gilman (Review), 844.
- Life of William H. Seward, The*, by Frederic Bancroft, by DANIEL H. CHAMBERLAIN (Review), 152.
- Lights and Shadows of a Long Episcopate*, by Henry B. Whipple, by CHARLES L. WELLS (Review), 177.
- Lincoln, Abraham, 209, 210, 213, 229, 468, 473, 474; Hon. Solomon, a letter to, 231.
- Lindsay, Thomas M., *Luther and the German Reformation*, by HENRY M. BAIRD (Review), 357.
- Lingard, John, 217.
- Linn, Senator, *Life and Speeches of*, 286.
- Linn Bill, the, 287, 294.
- Literary History of America, A*, by Barrett Wendell, by WALTER C. BRONSON (Review), 807.
- Livermore, Thomas L., *Numbers and Losses in the Civil War in America, 1861-1865* (Review), 598.
- Livingston, Peter V., 274; William, 273, 498.
- Livingston family, the, 261-263, 273, 274.
- Livingston manor, the, 261, 267.
- Livy, 215, 216.
- Locke, Richard Adams, 457.

- Logs of the Great Sea-Fights, 1794-1805*, Vol. II., edited by T. Sturges Jackson, Rear-Admiral (Review), 610.
 London, 660, 662; the liberties of, 653.
 Long Island, 261; Dutch and English settlements on, 15, 695-697, 703-711, 716, 717, 721-723; grant of, 693, 694; a public library on, 225, 226.
 Louis XI., 443, 445.
 Louis XIII., 688.
 Louis XVI., 235, 252, 253.
 Louis Philippe, 646.
 Lovejoy, A. L., 285-287, 291, 294.
 Lovelace, Governor, of N. Y., 700, 719, 721.
 Lowell, A. Lawrence, 424, 427; James Russell, 228, 229.
 LOWELL, A. LAWRENCE, *The Referendum in America*, by Ellis P. Oberholtzer (Review), 582.
 Ludlow, Roger, *The Colonial Lawmaker*, by John M. Taylor (Review), 612.
 Luigi, Pier, 641.
 Luther, Martin, 200-202.
Luther and the German Reformation, by Thomas M. Lindsay, by HENRY M. BAIRD (Review), 357.
 Mabillon, 431.
 Macaulay, Thomas Babington, 217-219, 227, 229, 230, 643.
 MacDonald, William, 425, 427, 428.
 MACDONALD, WILLIAM, *Canada under British Rule*, by Sir John G. Bourinot, (Review), 830.
 Mackinnon, James, *The History of Edward the Third*, by OLIVER H. RICHARDSON (Review), 125.
 MacMahon, Marshal de, 492, 765-769.
 MacMechan, Archibald M., editor, *Nova Scotia Archives*, II. (Review), 847.
 Macon, Nathaniel, 736.
 Macy, Jesse, *Political Parties in the United States*, by WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN (Review), 592.
 Madison, James, 449, 450.
 Mahan, Capt. Alfred T., 230, 424, 427.
 Maine, grant of, 693, 694.
 Malagola, Professor, of Bologna, 633, 635.
 Malatesta, Sigismondo, 638, 639; of Verucchio, 636.
 Malatestas of Rimini, the, 637-641.
 Malden, Henry E. (editor), *The Cely Papers* (Review), 384.
Malden, Mass., The History of, by De-
 loraine P. Corey, by HENRY H. EDES (Review), 175.
 Malmesbury, Lord, dispatch of, 247.
 Manhattan Island, 1, 5, 16.
Manual of Church History, A, by Albert H. Newman, by J. WINTHROP PLATNER (Review), 120.
 Marcel, Étienne, 440.
 Marcère, M. de, Minister for the Interior, 766, 768, 769.
 Margarita, 52.
 Mari, Giovanni, *Trattati Medievali di Rithmica Latina*, by C. H. H. (Review), 835.
 Mario, Jessie White, editor, *Scritti Scelti di Giuseppe Mazzini*, (Review), 838.
 Marsden, Secretary William, 508; letters to, 520-524, 528-530.
 Marshall, Chief-Justice John, 220; Thomas F., 233, 454; William I., 420.
 Marsilly-sur-Seine, 675.
 Martel, Minister of Justice, 766.
 Martha's Vineyard, grant of, 694.
 Martin, Mrs. Walter K., 736.
 Martinique, political conditions in, 475-494.
 Martyr, Peter, 680.
 Mason, Edward G., *Chapters from Illinois History*, by EDWIN ERLE SPARKS (Review), 825.
 Massachusetts, 202, 204, 207, 230; the colony, 694, 704 706-711; the election of 1848 in, 209; the Kansas question in, 41.
Massachusetts, Publications of the Colonial Society of, Vol. III. (Review), 390.
Massachusetts Bay in New England, The Puritan Republic of the, by Daniel W. Howe, by WILLIAM B. WEEDEN (Review), 138.
 Massachusetts Historical Society, 198, 199.
Massachusetts Historical Society, Collections of the, Seventh Series, I. (Jefferson Papers) (Review), 842.
Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings of the, Vol. XV. (Review), 389.
Massai, the, 634.
 MATHEWS, SHAILER, *Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, by George T. Purves (Review), 539.
 Mauritius, political conditions in, 495.
 Mauvillon, Major, 241, 242, 244, 247.
Maximilian in Mexico, by Sara Y. Stevenson (Review), 178.

- Maximilian of Austria, 443.
 Mazaruni, the river, 54, 57, 62.
 Mazzini, *Scritti Scelti* (Review), 838.
 McClure, A. K., *Our Presidents and How We Make Them* (Review), 174.
 McCrady, Gen. Edward, 736.
 McDougall, Alexander, 498.
 McGee, Col., 48.
 McGee, G. R., *A History of Tennessee for Use in Schools*, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 380.
 McGiffert, Arthur C., paper by, 417.
 McKINLEY, ALBERT E., *The English and Dutch Towns of New Netherland*, 1; *The Transition from Dutch to English Rule in New York*, 693.
 McKinley, President, 213.
 McL., A. C., *The University of Wisconsin*, edited by Reuben G. Thwaites (Review), 392.
 McLaughlin, Andrew C., 414, 427.
 McLoughlin and Old Oregon, by Eva E. Dye, by FRANCIS F. VICTOR (Review), 148.
 McMaster, John Bach, *A History of the People of the United States*, Vol. V., by CHARLES H. LEVERMORE (Review), 370.
 Medici, Cosimo dei, 641; Lorenzo dei, 641.
 Meeting of the American Historical Association at Detroit and Ann Arbor, 413.
 Melun, 442.
 Melville, Lord, 508, 509.
Memoirs of the Baroness Cécile de Courtot, compiled by Moritz von Kaisenberg, by CHARLES D. HAZEN (Review), 130.
 Mendelssohn, Moses, 244.
 Menou, Kléber et, en Égypte depuis le Départ de Bonaparte, edited by F. Rousseau, by VICTOR COFFIN (Review), 786.
 Men Who Made the Nation, The, by Edwin E. Sparks, by MARSHALL S. BROWN (Review), 818.
 Merivale, Charles, 217.
 MERIWETHER, C., *Verbeck of Japan, A Citizen of no Country*, by William E. Griffiths (Review), 829.
 MERRIAM, C. E., *Essai sur le Système de Politique Étrangère de J. J. Rousseau*, par J. L. Windenberger (Review), 385.
 Merrifield, William T., 41.
 Mespach (Newtown), 10.
 Metternich, Prince, 646.
 Mexico, Maximilian in, by Sara Y. Stevenson (Review), 178.
 Mexico, treasure-fleet from, 672; the war with, 207, 230-234.
 Michel de l'Hospital, by C. T. Atkinson, by HENRY M. BAIRD (Review), 127.
 Michelet, Jules, 431, 432.
 Michigan, the election of 1848 in, 209; Lake, 207, 211.
 Middelburg, 14.
 Midwout, 9, 14.
 Milford, Conn., 15.
 Military Reminiscences of the Civil War, by Gen. Jacob D. Cox, by H. V. BOYNTON (Review), 602.
 Milledgeville, 470, 471, 473.
 Millen, Ga., 471.
 MILLER, WILLIAM, *The Republic of San Marino*, 633.
 Milman, H. H., 217.
 Ministerial Crisis in France, 1876, A, with introduction by THEODORE STANTON (Document), 765.
 Minuit, Peter, 2.
 Mirabeau, Gabriel Honoré de Riquetti, Marquis de, 237-253.
 Mirabeau's Secret Mission to Berlin, by R. M. JOHNSTON, 235.
 Miranda, Francisco de, letters of, 518, 525-527.
 Miranda and the British Admiralty (Documents), 508.
 Missionary Herald, the, 296.
 Mississippi, public lands in, 28, 30.
 Mississippi, School History of, by Franklin L. Riley, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 846.
 Mississippi Historical Society, Publications of the, III. (Review), 847.
 Mississippi river, the, 21, 24, 211.
 Mississippi Valley, The, in the Civil War, by John Fiske, by BASIL W. DUKE (Review), 599.
 Missouri, the Kansas question in, 38, 39, 43; public land question in, 20, 31, 34.
 Missouri Compromise, the, 31.
 Mitchell, Admiral Sir A., letter to, 518.
 Mitford, William, 217.
 Mobile, 43.
 Modern Europe, Historical Atlas of, Part XXVI. (Review), 164; Part XXVII. (Review), 383.
 Mohammed II., 255.

- Mohawk river, the, 262, 267, 268.
 Moldavia, Austrian and Russian influence in, 257.
 Mommsen, Theodor, 222, 230, 424.
 Moncontour, battle of, 675.
Monitor, The, and the Navy under Steam, by Frank M. Bennett, by H. C. TAYLOR (Review), 820.
 Monnier, Sophie, Marquise de, 238.
 Monographic History of America, a project for, 424, 425.
 Monroe, James, 450.
Monroe, James, The Writings of, Vol. III., edited by Stanislaus Murray Hamilton (Review), 368; Vol. IV. (Review), 596.
 Monte, Fabiano da, 641.
 Montefeltro, bishops of, 635-638, 649; Count Guido di, 636; Speranza di, 637.
 Montegiardino, castle of, 639.
 Monte Titano, 633, 634, 637, 638, 640, 642, 644, 649.
 Montes, Roque de, 52.
 Montgomery, Ala., 40-43.
 MOONEY, JAMES, *Indianer und Anglo-Amerikaner*, von Georg Friederici (Review), 172.
 Moore, Charles, *The Northwest under Three Flags*, by B. A. HINSDALE (Review), 139.
 Moore, Capt. Edward, letter of, 517; Frederick W., 427.
 MOORE, FREDERICK W., *The Expansion of the American People, Social and Territorial*, by Edwin E. Sparks (Review), 805; *History of Tennessee, its People and its Institutions*, by William R. Garrett (Review), 380; *A History of Tennessee for Use in Schools*, by G. R. McGee (Review), 380; *School History of Mississippi*, by Franklin L. Riley (Review), 846.
 MOORE, J. B., *The History of the Clayton-Buwer Treaty*, by Ira B. Travis (Review), 150.
 Morley, John, *Oliver Cromwell*, by GUERNSEY JONES (Review), 562.
Morning Chronicle, the, 448.
Morning Post, the, 456.
 Morris, Henry C., *The History of Colonization from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, by CLIVE DAY (Review), 533.
 Morris family, the, 262.
 Morse, Anson D., 428.
 Moruca, colony on the, 57-59.
 Moses, writings of, 215, 230.
 Motley, John Lothrop, 220, 221.
 Mouan, Mons. de, 238.
 Mount Oread, Kan., 45.
 Mount Ste. Geneviève, 440.
 MUNRO, WILFRED H., *Old Trails on the Niagara Frontier*, by Frank H. Severance (Review), 176.
 Münster, disputed clauses of the Treaty of, 55, 56.
 Murat, Marshal, 646.
 Musgrave, George C., *Under Three Flags in Cuba*, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 179.
 Myers, P. V. N., *Rome: Its Rise and Fall*, by G. W. B. (Review), 382.
 Nantucket, grant of, 694.
 Napoleon I., 257.
Napoleons I., Die Kolonialpolitik, by Gustav Roloff (Review), 364.
Napoleon: The Last Phase, by Lord Rosebery, by THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE (Review), 565.
Napoleon's Invasion of Russia, by Hereford B. George, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 136.
 Napoleon III., 647, 648.
Narrative of General Venables, The, edited by Charles H. Firth (Review), 385.
 Nashville, 466, 467.
 National Assembly at Bordeaux, the, 496.
 National Democratic Party of Kansas, 48.
National Intelligencer, the, 30, 286.
Nationality in the United States, The Growth of, by John Bascom (Review), 172.
 Nebraska, Territory of, 38.
Negro, The Philadelphia: A Social Study, by W. E. Burghardt Du Bois (Review), 162.
 Nehra, Mme. de, 239.
 Nelson, William, Jr., 725.
 Netherlands, trade of, in Turkey, 256.
 New Amsterdam, 4, 5, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16-18; government of, 693-697, 711, 714, 717.
 Newcastle, 719-722.
New Chapter, A, in the Life of Thutmose III., by James H. Breasted, by CHARLES F. KENT (Review), 832.

- New England, 12, 13; colonial government of, 696, 704-714, 716, 721, 723, 724; public land question in, 24, 25.
- Newfoundland, voyage to, 671-673.
- New France, explorations in, 675-691.
- New France, History and General Description of*, Vol. I., by F. X. de Charlevoix, edited by John G. Shea (Review), 811.
- New Haarlem, 6, 8, 9.
- New Haven, the colony of, 15, 16, 703, 704, 706-711.
- Newman, Albert H., *A Manual of Church History*, by J. WINTHROP PLATNER (Review), 120.
- New Netherland, 695, 696, 703, 704, 708, 712, 713.
- New Netherland Company, charter of the, 1.
- New Netherlands, The English and Dutch Towns of*, by ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, 1.
- New Orleans, 43.
- Newtown (Mespeth), 10.
- New Utrecht, 9.
- New York, 205, 207, 208; the province of, 260-274.
- New York, Colonial, Nominations in*, by CARL BECKER, 260.
- New York, the Transition from Dutch to English Rule in*, by ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, 693.
- New York Associated Press, the, 464.
- New York city, colonial government of, 697, 700-703, 712, 717, 718, 721-724; newspapers in, 447; nominations in, 272-274.
- New York Daily Advertiser*, the, 457.
- New York Gazette*, Gaine's, 499.
- New York Tribune*, the, 33.
- Niagara Frontier in 1812, The Documentary History of the Campaign upon the*, edited by Col. E. Cruikshank (Review), 845.
- Niagara Frontier, Old Trails on the*, by Frank H. Severance, by WILFRED H. MUNRO (Review), 176.
- Nichols, Colonel Richard, 695-700, 703-705, 707-717.
- Nicolai, M., 241-244.
- Niles's Register*, 23, 286.
- Nineteenth Century, An Outline of Political Growth in the*, by Edmund H. Sears, by EDMUND C. BURNETT (Review), 134.
- Noah, Mordecai Manasseh, 456, 459, 463.
- Noble, Edmund, *Russia and the Russians*, by ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE (Review), 791.
- Nominating convention, origin of the, 260.
- Nominations in Colonial New York*, by CARL BECKER, 260.
- Normandy, the duchy of, 442.
- Northcote, the manor of, 665.
- Northwest under Three Flags, The*, by Charles Moore, by B. A. HINSDALE (Review), 139.
- Nova Scotia Archives*, II. (Review), 847.
- Nullification Movement in South Carolina, 1830-1834, Letters on the* (Documents), 736.
- Numbers and Losses in the Civil War in America, 1861-1865*, by Thomas L. Livermore (Review), 598.
- Oberholtzer, Ellis P., *The Referendum in America*, by A. LAWRENCE LOWELL (Review), 582.
- O'Connell, Daniel, *and the Revival of National Life in Ireland*, by Robert Dunlop, by VICTOR COFFIN (Review), 567.
- Ohio, the election of 1848 in, 209.
- Old Landmarks and Historic Personages of Boston*, by Samuel A. Drake (Review), 391.
- Old Trails on the Niagara Frontier*, by Frank H. Severance, by WILFRED H. MUNRO (Review), 176.
- Oliver Cromwell*, by John Morley, by GUERNSEY JONES (Review), 562.
- Oliver Cromwell*, by Theodore Roosevelt, by GUERNSEY JONES (Review), 562.
- Olney, Secretary, 49.
- Onofri, Antonio, 646; Giuseppe, 645.
- Ontario, *The Archaeological Reports of* (Review), 393.
- On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer; The Diary and Itinerary of Francisco Garcés*, by Elliott Coues, by FRANK W. BLACKMAR (Review), 141.
- Orange, the House of, 246.
- Oregon, the acquisition of, 276-300; emigration to, 277-300; missions in, 277-300; the public land question in, 27, 35.
- Origin of the Apostles' Creed (paper), 417.
- Origin of Species*, publication of, 199.
- Orinoco, the river, 52, 55, 58, 60, 63.
- Orléans, Louis, Duke of, 440, 441, 443, 444; Philippe Égalité, Duke of, 240, 242, 247.

- Orme, Thomas J., 39.
 Orsi, Pietro, 435.
 OSGOOD, HERBERT L., introduction to *The Society of Dissenters* (Documents), 498.
 Otho, the Emperor, 635.
 Otis, James, 302.
 Ottawa river, the, 690.
 Ottoman Empire, the, 254.
Our Presidents and How We Make Them, by A. K. McClure (Review), 174.
Outline, An, of Political Growth in the Nineteenth Century, by Edmund H. Sears, by EDMUND C. BURNETT (Review), 134.
Outlines of the History of Religion, by John K. Ingram, by WALTER G. EVERETT (Review), 165.
 Owen, Robert, 452.
 Oxford, 663-667.
Pacific and the Far East, American Relations in, by James M. Callahan, by HIRAM BINGHAM, JR. (Review), 827.
 Page, Thomas W., *The End of Villainage in England*, by E. P. CHEYNEY (Review), 355.
 Palfrey, J. G., 220, 221.
 Panchaud, the banker, 239-242, 249, 252.
 Parel, Abbé, 490.
 Paris, 648, 676, 677, 679.
 Paris, Congress of 1856, 258.
 Paris, Matthew, 216.
Paris, Political Influence of the University of, in the Middle Ages, by CHARLES GROSS, 440.
Paris as Seen and Described by Famous Writers, edited and translated by Esther Singleton, by F. M. WARREN (Review), 170.
Parker, Theodore, Preacher and Reformer, by John W. Chadwick, by J. P. QUINCY (Review), 374.
 Parkman, Francis, 220, 222.
Parkman, Francis, A Life of, by Charles H. Farnham, by BARRETT WENDELL (Review), 376.
 Parlement of Paris, the, 442-444.
 Parmele, Mary P., *Russia, A Short History of* (Review), 171.
 Parmentiers, voyages of the, 671.
 Party Struggles in Missouri, 1861-1865 (paper), 420.
 Passano, L. M., *History of Maryland* (Review), 845.
 Paul II., Pope, 639.
 Paul III., 641.
 Paulding, James K., 455.
Paul Jones, Founder of the American Navy, by Augustus C. Buell, by EDWARD FIELD (Review), 589.
Pausanias and other Greek Sketches, by J. G. Frazer (Review), 382.
 Payne, Edward J., *History of the New World called America*, Vol. II., by FRANK RUSSELL (Review), 796.
Peace Conference at the Hague, The, and its Bearings on International Law and Policy, by Frederick W. Holls, by GEORGE L. RIVES (Review), 572.
 PEIRCE, C. S., *Thomas Harriot, the Mathematician, the Philosopher, and the Scholar*, by Henry Stevens (Review), 557.
 Pelizzaro, Giacomo, 638.
 Penna Rossa, the castle of, 635.
 Pennsylvania, 202; public land policy of, 27, 34, 35.
Pennsylvania, Colonial, Conrad Weiser and the Indian Policy of, by Joseph S. Walton (Review), 816.
Pennsylvania, Colonial, The German and Swiss Settlements of, by Oscar Kuhns, by M. D. LEARNED (Review), 813.
 Pepin, 634; the donation of, 634, 635.
 PERKINS, JAMES BRECK, *La Noblesse Française sous Richelieu*, par le Vicomet G. d'Avenel (Review), 781.
 Perkins, James B., *Richelieu and the Growth of French Power*, by HENRY E. BOURNE (Review), 561.
 Perugia, 636.
 Pesaro, 645.
 Peter the Hermit, 429.
Petigru, James Louis, Life of, by Grayson, 737.
 Pflugk-Harttung, Julius, 438.
Philadelphia Negro, The: A Social Study, by W. E. Burghardt Du Bois (Review), 162.
 Phila'ethes, the, 242.
 Philipse family, the, 262.
 Picanon, colonial inspector, 489.
 Pickens, Francis W., 736; letters to, 752, 758, 764.
 Pierce, Franklin, 34, 36.
Pigeon, the ship, 54.
Pilgrim's Progress, 225.
 Pitt, William, 508; policy of, 245-247, 250, 251.

- Pius II., 639.
 Pius VI., 645.
 Pius VIII., 646.
 Pius IX., 647.
 Plaine, François, article by, 432-436.
 PLATNER, J. WINTHROP, *A Manual of Church History*, by Albert H. Newman (Review), 120.
 Poinsett, Joel R., memoir of, by Stillé, 737.
Political Influence, The, of the University of Paris in the Middle Ages, by CHARLES GROSS, 440.
Political Parties in the United States, 1846-1861, by Jesse Macy, also general histories of, by J. P. Gordy and James H. Hopkins, by WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN (Review), 592.
 Pollard, A. F., *England under the Protector Somerset*, by E. P. CHEYNEY (Review), 553.
 Pomeroy, the, 57-59.
 Poole, R. L. (editor), *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe*, Part XXVI., 164; Part XXVII. (Review), 383.
 Popham, Sir Home, 508; memorandum by, 509.
 Porto Rico, 672, 673; a letter from the Bishop of, 1634, 55.
 Port Royal in Acadia, 676, 677, 683, 684, 687-689, 691.
 Portugal, possessions of, in America, 671.
 Pothuau, Admiral, 496.
 Powell, Lyman P. (editor), *Historic Towns of the Southern States*, by B. J. RAMAGE (Review), 824.
 Powicke, Fred. J., *Henry Barrow, Separatist, and the Exiled Church of Amsterdam*, by WILLISTON WALKER (Review), 777.
 Pownall, Governor, 508.
Preliminary Stages of the Peace of Amiens, by H. M. Bowman (Review), 366.
 Prescott, William H., 220.
 Presidential election of 1848, the, 208, 209.
Primitive Love and Love-Stories, by Henry T. Finck, by WALTER G. EVERETT (Review), 108.
Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada (Review), 392.
Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Vol. XV. (Review), 389.
 Progressist party in Martinique, the, 486, 487.
Protestant Interest, The, in Cromwell's Foreign Relations, by Jacob N. Bowman, by GUERNSEY JONES (Review), 837.
 Public lands, the, 19-37.
Public Papers of George Clinton, edited by Hugh Hastings (Review), 391.
Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Vol. III. (Review), 390.
Puritan Republic of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, The, by Daniel W. Howe, by WILLIAM B. WEEDEN (Review), 138.
 Purves, George T., *Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, by SHAILER MATHEWS (Review), 539.
 Quebec, 685.
 QUINCY, J. P., *Theodore Parker, Preacher and Reformer*, by John W. Chadwick (Review), 374.
Races of Man, The, by J. Deniker, by WILLIAM Z. RIPLEY (Review), 110.
 Radulf, Glaber, 431, 433.
 Railroad, Land-grant (1850), 28.
 Raleigh, Sir Walter, 52.
 RAMAGE, B. J., *Historic Towns of the Southern States*, edited by Lyman P. Powell (Review), 824.
 Ramusio, works of, 679, 680.
 Rand, Benjamin (editor), *The Life, Unpublished Letters, etc., of Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury*, by JAMES H. TUFTS (Review), 609.
 Randolph, John, of Roanoke, 736.
 Randolph-Macon College, 736.
 Rawson, Edward K., *Twenty Famous Naval Battles*, by W. F. TILTON (Review), 118.
 Razet, Foucaut du, 60.
 Red River country, the, 277, 280, 297.
 Reede, Baron de, 251.
 Reeder, Governor, of Kan., 44.
Referendum in America, The, by Ellis P. Oberholtzer, by A. LAWRENCE LOWELL (Review), 582.
Reformation, The, by Williston Walker (Review), 549.
 Reinach, Salomon (translator), *Histoire de l'Inquisition au Moyen-Age*, by Henry C. Lea, by CHARLES H. HASKINS (Review), 834.
 Reinhard, Madame, *Lettres de, à sa Mère*, edited by the Baroness de Wimpffen, by FERDINAND SCHWILL (Review), 787.

- Reinsch, Paul S., *English Common Law in the Early American Colonies*, by W. M. WEST (Review), 584.
- REINSCH, PAUL S., *French Experience with Representative Government in the West Indies*, 475.
- Relation Dernière*, of Lescarbot, 689, 690.
- Religion, Outlines of the History of*, by John K. Ingram, by WALTER G. EVERETT (Review), 165.
- Religion of Israel to the Exile*, by Karl Budde, by C. H. TOY (Review), 112.
- Remarks on Several Parts of Italy*, 643.
- Rensselaerswyck, 717.
- Republic of San Marino, the*, by WILLIAM MILLER, 633.
- Réunion, political conditions in, 477-482.
- Rey, Francis, 257.
- Rhodes, James Ford, 414, 427; address by, 417, 418.
- RHODES, JAMES FORD, *Sherman's March to the Sea*, 466.
- Rhys, John, and David Brynmor Jones, *The Welsh People*, by F. N. ROBINSON (Review), 349.
- Riant, Count Paul, 438; the library of, 415.
- Ribaut, Jean, expedition of, 678.
- Ribot, Deputy, 488.
- Richardson, E. C., 428.
- RICHARDSON, OLIVER H., *The History of Edward the Third*, by James Mackinnon (Review), 125.
- Richelieu and the Growth of French Power*, by James B. Perkins, by HENRY E. BOURNE (Review), 561.
- Richmond Enquirer*, the, 450.
- Richmond Junta, the, 450.
- Ridpath, John C. (deceased), 183.
- Riggs, James S., *A History of the Jewish People during the Maccabean and Roman Periods* (Review), 166.
- Riley, Franklin L., *School History of Mississippi*, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 846.
- Rimini, 633-641.
- Ripley, W. Z., 423.
- Rise of Metropolitan Journalism, The*, by CHARLES H. LEVERMORE, 446.
- Risings in the English Monastic Towns in 1327*, by NORMAN MACLAREN TRENHOLME, 650.
- Ritchie, Thomas, 450.
- RIVES, GEORGE L., *The Peace Conference at the Hague*, by Frederick W. Holls (Review), 572.
- Rivington's *Gazette*, 447, 453.
- Robertson, William, 217.
- Robertson's *View of the Progress of Society in Europe*, 431, 432.
- Roberval, discoveries of, 671, 674, 680, 682, 688.
- ROBINSON, F. N., *The Welsh People*, by John Rhys and David Brynmor Jones (Review), 349.
- Robinson, J. H., 428.
- Roger Ludlow, *The Colonial Lawmaker*, by John M. Taylor (Review), 612.
- Rogers, Cornelius, 278.
- Rollin's *Ancient History*, 226.
- Roloff, Gustav, *Die Kolonialpolitik Napoleons I.* (Review), 364.
- Romagna, the, 636, 638, 640, 644, 646.
- Rome, 646, 661.
- Rome: Its Rise and Fall*, by P. V. N. Myers, by G. W. B. (Review), 382.
- Roncière, Charles de la, *Histoire de la Marine Française. Vol. II. La Guerre de Cent Ans; Révolution Maritime*, by JULIAN S. CORBETT (Review), 546.
- Roosevelt, Theodore, *Oliver Cromwell*, by GUERNSEY JONES (Review), 562.
- Ropes, John C., 467, 469.
- Rosebery, Lord, *Napoleon: The Last Phase*, by THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE (Review), 565.
- Rosières, Raoul, 434, 435.
- Rouen, 442, 680, 683.
- Round, J. Horace (editor), *Calendar of Documents preserved in France, illustrative of the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, by GEORGE BURTON ADAMS (Review), 351.
- Rousseau, F. (editor), *Kléber et Menou en Égypte depuis le Départ de Bonaparte*, by VICTOR COFFIN (Review), 786.
- Rousseau, J. J., *Essai sur le Système de Politique Étrangère de*, par J. L. Windenberger, by C. E. MERRIAM (Review), 385.
- Roussel, le Père, *Correspondance de Le Coz, Évêque Constitutionnel d'Ille-et-Vilaine*, by CHARLES L. WELLS (Review), 133.
- Royal Historical Society, Transactions of the*, new series, XIV. (Review), 835.
- Roy, Jules, 435.

- Rullkoetter, William, *The Legal Protection of Woman among the Ancient Germans*, by GUY C. LEE (Review), 833.
- Russel, Henry, 423.
- RUSSELL, FRANK, *History of the New World called America*, Vol. II., by Edward J. Payne (Review), 796.
- Russia, A Short History of*, by Mary P. Parmele (Review), 171.
- Russia, Napoleon's Invasion of*, by Hereford B. George, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 136.
- Russia and the Russians*, by Edmund Noble, by ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE (Review), 791.
- Russia, slavery in, 202; trading privileges of, in Turkey, 257.
- Rustdorp (Jamaica), L. I., 14.
- Sabatier, Paul (editor), *Collection de Documents pour l'Histoire Religieuse et Littéraire du Moyen Age*, Tomes I. et II. (Review), 544.
- Sable Id., expedition to, 674.
- Saguenay, the Kingdom of, 671, 682.
- St. Albans, the town of, 651-659, 663, 968, 669.
- St. Charles, Bank of, 240.
- Ste. Croix, island of, 676, 681-683, 687.
- St. David's, Bishop of, 666.
- St. Helen, the church of, 663, 664.
- St. John river, 676.
- Saint-Just, account of New France by, 688, 690.
- St. Lawrence, the Gulf of, 671.
- St. Lawrence river, discovery and exploration of, 671, 680, 681, 685, 688, 690.
- St. Louis, 43, 292, 293.
- St. Malo, 685.
- St. Michel, Mont, 685.
- St. Nicholas, the church of, 664, 665, 668.
- St. Pantaleon, chronicle of, 431.
- St. Pierre in Martinique, 60; botanical garden at, 485.
- St. Sauveur, 690.
- St. Vincent, Cape, 672.
- Salaberry, Comte de, *Souvenirs Politiques du, sur la Restauration*, edited by Comte de Salaberry, by VICTOR COFFIN (Review), 789.
- Salmon, Lucy M., 428.
- SANBORN, JOHN BELL, *Some Political Aspects of Homestead Legislation*, 19.
- San German in Porto Rico, 672.
- San Leo, 637, 641.
- San Marino, the castle of, 666; the government of, 635.
- San Marino, The Republic of*, by WILLIAM MILLER, 633.
- Santiago, capture of, 673.
- Santiago, Felipe de, letters of, 52.
- Santo Thomé, town of, 52, 54, 55, 57, 59.
- Savage, Samuel P., 303.
- Savannah, 469, 472, 474.
- Say, Leon, Minister of Finance, 766, 767, 769.
- Schenectady, representative for, 266.
- Schoelcher, Senator, 484.
- Schofield, General, 467.
- School History of Mississippi*, by Franklin L. Riley, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 846.
- Schouler, James, 427.
- Schurz, Carl, 213.
- Schuyler, Eugene, *Italian Influences*, by WILLIAM R. THAYER (Review), 838; *Selected Essays*, by JAMES B. ANGELL (Review), 839.
- Schuyler, Philip, 269.
- Schuyler family, the, 262, 263.
- Schuyllkill settlements, the, 720.
- SCHWILL, FERDINAND, *Lettres de Madame Reinhard à sa Mère*, edited by the Baroness de Wimpffen (Review), 787; *The Story of Assisi*, by Lina Duff Gordon (Review), 608.
- Scofield, Cora L., *A Study of the Court of Star Chamber*, by GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD (Review), 775.
- Scotland, A History of, from the Roman Occupation*, I., by Andrew Lang, by GAILLARD T. LAPSLEY (Review), 121.
- Scott, John, 703; John Morin, 273, 274, 498; Major John, 53.
- Sears, Edmund H., *An Outline of Political Growth in the Nineteenth Century*, by EDMUND C. BURNETT (Review), 134.
- Second Missouri Compromise, Omitted Chapter in the History of the (paper), 420.
- Secret History of the Court of Berlin*, Mirabeau's, 235, 236; editions of, 235, 236.
- Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina (Justin Winsor prize essay), 425.

- Selected Essays*, by Eugene Schuyler, by JAMES B. ANGELL (Review), 839.
- Selkirk Settlement, 297.
- Senegal, representation in, 496.
- Señs et Vilains au Moyen Age*, par Henri Doniol, by E. P. CHEYNEY (Review), 355.
- Sergius, Pope, 438.
- Serravalle, castle and village of, 639, 640, 644; Giovanni Bertholdi di, 640.
- Sesostris*, von Kurt Sethe, by JAMES HENRY BREASTED (Review), 535.
- Sethe, Kurt, *Sesostris*, by JAMES HENRY BREASTED (Review), 535.
- Severance, Frank H., *Old Trails on the Niagara Frontier*, by WILFRED H. MUNRO (Review), 176.
- Seward, William H., 33, 450, 454, 461.
- Seward, William H., The Life of*, by Frederic Bancroft, by DANIEL H. CHAMBERLAIN (Review), 152.
- Shaftesbury, Life, Unpublished Letters, etc., of Anthony, Earl of*, edited by Benjamin Rand, by JAMES H. TUFTS (Review), 609.
- Shannon, Governor, of Kansas, 44.
- Shaper, W. A., recipient of the Justin Winsor prize, 425.
- Shaw, William A., *A History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and Commonwealth*, by W. DAWSON JOHNSTON (Review), 128.
- Shea, John G. (editor), *History and General Description of New France*, Vol. I., by F. X. de Charlevoix (Review), 811.
- Shepard, H. D., 456.
- Sherman's March to the Sea*, by JAMES FORD RHODES, 466.
- Short History of Russia, A*, by Mary P. Parmele (Review), 171.
- Shuckburgh, Evelyn S. (editor), *The Letters of Cicero*, by ALBERT GRANGER HARKNESS (Review), 607.
- Siam, 475.
- Side Lights on English History*, by Ernest F. Henderson, by W. DAWSON JOHNSTON (Review), 168.
- Sifted Grain, The, and the Grain Sifters*, by CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, 197.
- Sigebert of Gembloux, 430.
- Signal*, the, 463.
- Silver Map of the World, The; A Geographical Essay*, by Miller Christy, by GEORGE PARKER WINSHIP, (Review), 358.
- Silver Run, Ala., 40.
- Simon, Fray Pedro, 52; Jules, 765-769.
- Simpson, Sir George, 289, 297, 299.
- Singleton, Esther (editor), *Paris as Seen and Described by Famous Writers*, by F. M. WARREN (Review), 170.
- Skrifter utgifna af Kongl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Upsala* (Review), 386.
- Slave-Trade, The American*, by John R. Spears, by EDWARD D. COLLINS (Review), 586.
- Slocum, General, 473.
- Smith, Rev. Asa B., 278; Joseph, 452; Theodore C., 422, 427; William, 261; William, Jr., 261, 273.
- SMITH, W. ROY, *Constitutional History of South Carolina*, by D. D. WALLACE (Review), 175.
- Smith family, the, 262.
- Snell, F. J., *Wesley and Methodism*, by WILLIAM EDWARDS HUNTINGTON (Review), 783.
- Socialist party in Martinique, the, 486-488, 492.
- Society of Dissenters, The, founded at New York in 1769*, Introduction to by HERBERT L. OSGOOD (Documents), 498.
- Sofraga, Marquis of, a report of, 54.
- Some Political Aspects of Homestead Legislation*, by JOHN BELL SANBORN, 19.
- Somerset, England under the Protector*, by A. F. POLLARD, by E. P. CHEYNEY (Review), 553.
- Source-Book of English History*, edited by Elizabeth K. Kendall (Review), 383.
- Source-Book of English History*, by Guy C. Lee (Review), 384.
- Sources and Literature, The, of English History from the Earliest Times to about 1485*, by Charles Gross, by EDWARD P. CHEYNEY (Review), 540.
- Sources for the First Crusade (paper), 415.
- South Africa, With both Armies in*, by Richard H. Davis, by THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE (Review), 611.
- South Carolina, 202, 203, 207, 671; the Kansas Question in, 39, 41, 42; College, 725, 726.
- South Carolina, Constitutional History of*, by D. D. WALLACE, by W. ROY SMITH (Review), 175.

- South Carolina, Letters on the Nullification Movement in, 1830-1834* (Documents), 736.
- Souvenirs Politiques du Comte de Salaberry sur la Restauration*, edited by Comte de Salaberry, by VICTOR COFFIN (Review), 789.
- Spain, A History of*, by Ulick R. Burke, edited by Martin A. S. Hume, by CHARLES H. HASKINS (Review), 167.
- Spain, possessions of, in America, 671.
- Spain, The Downfall of: Naval History of the Spanish-American War*, by H. W. Wilson, by H. C. TAYLOR (Review), 159.
- Spanish America, The Diplomatic Relations of the United States and*, by John H. Latané (Review), 146.
- Spalding, Rev. Henry H., 278-285, 288, 289, 290, 294-300.
- Sparks, E. E., 427.
- SPARKS, EDWIN ERLE, *Chapters from Illinois History*, by Edward G. Mason (Review), 825.
- Sparks, Edwin E., *The Expansion of the American People, Social and Territorial*, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 805; *The Men Who Made the Nation*, by MARSHALL S. BROWN (Review) 818.
- Spears, John R., *The American Slave Trade*, by EDWARD D. COLLINS (Review), 586.
- Specie circular of 1836, the, 25.
- Spectator*, the, 225.
- Speculum Perfectionis, seu Sancti Francisci Legenda Antiquissima*, edited by Paul Sabatier (Review), 544.
- Stadacona, 681.
- Stage-Coach and Tavern Days*, by Alice Morse Earle, by WILLIAM B. WEEDEN (Review), 580.
- STANTON, THEODORE, introduction to *A Ministerial Crisis in France, 1876*, (Documents), 765.
- Star Chamber, A Study of the Court of*, by Cora L. Scofield, by GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD (Review), 775.
- Staten Island, 8, 261, 696, 704.
- States General, action of, toward New Netherland, 3, 4, 12, 16.
- Statham, S. P. H., *History of the Castle, Town and Port of Dover* (Review), 169.
- Steele, Frederick M., 341.
- Steevens, G. W., *From Capetown to Ladysmith*, edited by Vernon Blackburn (Review), 170.
- Stephen, Abbot of S. Marino, 635.
- Stephens, H. Morse, address by, 418.
- Stevens, Henry, *Thomas Hariot, the Mathematician, the Philosopher, and the Scholar*, by C. S. PEIRCE (Review), 557.
- Stevenson, Sara Y., *Maximilian in Mexico* (Review), 178.
- Stirling, Lord, 10.
- Stone, Col. Henry, 469.
- Stony Point on the Hudson, The Storming of*, by Henry P. Johnston, by JOHN BIGELOW, JR. (Review), 144.
- Storey, Moorfield, *Charles Sumner* (Review), 157.
- Storming of Stony Point on the Hudson, The*, by Henry P. Johnston, by JOHN BIGELOW, JR. (Review), 144.
- Story, Francis V., 456.
- Story of Assisi, The*, by Lina Duff Gordon, by FERDINAND SCHWILL (Review), 608.
- Stoughton, Israel, 301; William, sermon by, 197, 211.
- Struensee, Charles von, 241, 249.
- Stryker, General William S. (deceased), 396.
- Stubbs, William, Bishop of Oxford, 439; (deceased), 867.
- Study of the Court of Star Chamber, A*, by Cora L. Scofield, by GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD (Review), 775.
- Stuyvesant, Peter, 5, 6, 8, 13, 18, 708.
- Successors of Drake, The*, by Julian S. Corbett, by W. F. TILTON (Review), 554.
- Suffolk, 659.
- Suleiman, Sultan, 255.
- Sumner, Charles*, by Moorfield Storey (Review), 157.
- Sumner, Colonel, 46, 47.
- Sun, the, 457, 458, 460, 464, 465.
- Superior, Lake, 211.
- Survey of American History, A; Source Extracts*, by Howard W. Caldwell (Review), 388.
- Surveys, Historic and Economic*, by W. J. Ashley, by CHARLES H. HULL (Review), 793.
- Sweden, claims to South America of, 60, 61.
- Switzerland, 689, 690.

- Sybel, Heinrich von, 429, 434, 438, 439.
 Syria, trade of, 254, 255.
Tableau de la Suisse, 691.
 Tacitus, 215-217, 222, 230.
 Tadoussac, 681.
 Talleyrand, 236, 240-243, 247, 248, 252.
 Tammany Society, the, 456, 459.
Tatler, the, 225.
 TAYLOR, H. C., *The Downfall of Spain: Naval History of the Spanish-American War*, by H. W. Wilson (Review), 159; *The Frigate Constitution*, by Ira N. Hollis (Review), 820; *The Monitor*, by Frank M. Bennett (Review), 820.
 Taylor, John M., *Roger Ludlow, The Colonial Lawmaker* (Review), 612.
 Taylor, General Zachary, 208, 460.
 Teisserenc de Bort, M., Minister of Agriculture, 766, 768, 769.
 Tennessee, 466, 467; public land question in, 20, 27, 30, 31, 33.
Tennessee, A History of, from 1663 to 1900, for Use in Schools, by G. R. McGee, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 380.
Tennessee, its People and its Institutions, History of, by William R. Garrett, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 380.
 Tennessee river, the, 466.
Territorial Acquisitions of the United States, by Edward Bicknell (Review), 173.
 Texas, public land policy of, 26, 27.
 Thacher, Oxenbridge, 302.
 Thatcher, Oliver J., paper by, 415.
 Thayer, Eli, 41.
 THAYER, WILLIAM R., *Italian Influences*, by Eugene Schuyler (Review); *The Venetian Republic; Its Rise, its Growth and its Fall*, 421-1797, by W. Carew Hazlitt (Review), 353.
Theodore Beza, the Counsellor of the French Reformation (1519-1605), by Henry M. Baird, by PAUL VAN DYKE (Review), 551.
Theodore Parker, Preacher and Reformer, by John W. Chadwick, by J. P. QUINCY (Review), 374.
 Thevet, André, 680.
 Thietmar, 431.
 Thirlwall, Bishop C., 217.
Thirty Years' View, Benton's, 286.
 Thomas, General, 466-468.
Thomas Hariot, the Mathematician, the Philosopher, and the Scholar, by Henry Stevens, by C. S. PEIRCE (Review), 557.
 Thompson, Dr. James Westfall, 341.
 Thucydides, 215-217, 222, 230.
Thutmose III., A New Chapter in the Life of, by James H. Breasted, by CHARLES F. KENT (Review), 832.
 Thwaites, Reuben G., 423, 425, 427.
 Thwaites, Reuben G. (editor), *The University of Wisconsin*, by A. C. McL. (Review), 392.
 Tichenor, I. T., 42.
 TILTON, W. F., *The Successors of Drake*, by Julian S. Corbett (Review), 554; *Twenty Famous Naval Battles*, by Edward K. Rawson (Review), 118.
Times, the New York, 455.
 Tinnicum Id., 720.
 Tobago, 55, 57.
 Tocoropati, the island, 62.
 Tompkins, Governor, of N. Y., 449.
 Toombs, Robert, 47.
Towns, the English Monastic, Risings in, in 1327, by NORMAN MACLAREN TREN HOLME, 650.
 TOY, C. H., *Encyclopaedia Biblica: A Critical Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. II., edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black (Review), 770; *Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews*, by Lyman Abbott (Review), 772; *Religion of Israel to the Exile*, by Karl Budde (Review), 112.
Transit of Civilization, The, from England to America in the Seventeenth Century, by Edward Eggleston, by BARRETT WENDELL (Review), 802.
Transition, The, from Dutch to English Rule in New York, by ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, 693.
 Travis, Ira B., *The History of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty*, by J. B. MOORE (Review), 150.
 Treadwell, B. F., 43.
 TRENHOLME, NORMAN MACLAREN, *The Risings in the English Monastic Towns in 1327*, 650.
Tribune, the, 457.
 Trinidad, 52.
 Tritermus, Johannes, 430.
 Trosly, Council of, 432.
 Troyes, the treaty of, 442.

- Tucker, William Warren, 633.
- TUCKERMAN, FREDERICK (editor), *Diary of Samuel Cooper, 1775-1776* (Documents), 301.
- TUFTS, JAMES H., *English Political Philosophy from Hobbes to Maine*, by William Graham (Review), 360; *The Life, Unpublished Letters and Philosophical Regimen of Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury*, edited by Benjamin Rand (Review), 609.
- Tunis, the government of, 496.
- Turkish Capitulations, The*, by JAMES B. ANGELL, 254.
- Twenty Famous Naval Battles*, by Edward K. Rawson, by W. F. TILTON (Review), 118.
- Tyler, John, President, 287, 289, 291, 299, 300.
- Tyler, Lyon G., 427.
- Tyler, Lyon G., *The Cradle of the Republic; Jamestown and James River* (Review), 391.
- Tyler, Moses Coit, death of, 414, 424, 613.
- Tynemouth, 657.
- Under Three Flags in Cuba*, by George C. Musgrave, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 179.
- United States, Education in the*, edited by Nicholas M. Butler (Review), 393.
- United States, Essays on the Monetary History of the*, by Charles J. Bullock, by DAVIS RICH DEWEY (Review), 579.
- United States, extraterritorial jurisdiction of, in Turkey, 258, 259; public lands of the, 19-37.
- United States, The Growth of Nationality in the*, by John Bascom (Review), 172.
- United States, A History of Banking in the*, by John Jay Knox, by DAVIS RICH DEWEY (Review), 377.
- United States, A History of the People of the*, Vol. V., by John Bach McMaster, by CHARLES H. LEVERMORE (Review), 370.
- United States, A History of Political Parties in the*, Vol. I., by J. P. Gordy, by WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN (Review), 592.
- United States, A History of Political Parties in the*, by James H. Hopkins, by WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN (Review), 592.
- United States, Political Parties in the*, by Jesse Macy, by WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN (Review), 592.
- United States, Territorial Acquisitions of the*, by Edward Bicknell (Review), 173.
- United States and Spanish America, The Diplomatic Relations of the*, by John H. Latané (Review), 146.
- University of Wisconsin, The: its History and its Alumni*, edited by Reuben G. Thwaites, by A. C. McL. (Review), 392.
- Upland (Chester), 720-723.
- Urban VIII., 642.
- Urbino, the duchy of, 640, 641, 649; Francesco Maria II. of, 642; Frederico, count of, 637, 639; Guido, count of, 638, 639; Oddo Antonio of, 639.
- Valli, Matteo, 643.
- Valperque, Françoise de, 691.
- Van Brugh family, the, 262.
- Van Buren, Martin, 449, 450, 452, 459, 463.
- Van Cortlandt family, the, 262.
- VAN DYKE, PAUL, *Theodore Beza, the Counsellor of the French Reformation*, by Henry M. Baird (Review), 551.
- Van Rensselaer manor, the, 261, 262, 267.
- Van Wyck, Theodore, 274.
- Veere, 57.
- Venables, General, The Narrative of*, edited by Charles H. Firth (Review), 385.
- Venetian Republic, The; Its Rise, its Growth and its Fall, 421-1797*, by W. Carew Hazlitt, by WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER (Review), 353.
- Venezuela, 508; the Boundary Commission and, 49-59.
- Venice, 640; trade of, 254, 255.
- Verbeck of Japan, A Citizen of no Country*, by William E. Griffis, by C. MERIWETHER (Review), 829.
- Vergennes, Minister of Foreign Affairs, 241.
- Vermont, the election of 1848 in, 209.
- Verrazano, voyages of, 671, 677, 678.
- Verrucchio, Leonardo Pio of, 641.
- Vervins, 674, 675.
- Vicksburg campaign, the, 466.
- Victor, Frances F., 284.
- VICTOR, FRANCES FULLER, *McLoughlin and Old Oregon*, by Eva E. Dye (Review), 148.

- Victoria Queen, 648.
 Viedma, Don Pedro de, letter from, 57.
Villainage in England, The End of, by Thomas W. Page, by E. P. CHEYNEY (Review), 355.
 VILLARD, OSWALD GARRISON, *Henry Knox*, by Noah Brooks (Review), 367.
 Villegagnon, voyages of, 671, 677, 679.
 Vincennes, prison of, 238.
 Vincent, John M., 416, 427.
 Virginia, 202-204; the Great Valley of, 21; public land question in, 23.
 Vittorio Emanuele III., 648.
 Vlissingen (Flushing), 10.
 Voltaire, 215, 216, 230, 245.
 Voss, Frau'lein von, 243, 248.
 Vreedland (Westchester), 14.
 Waddington, Minister of Public Instruction, 766-768.
 Waillatpu, Ore., 280, 283, 284, 297.
 Waini; the river, 59.
 Wakarusa War, the, 45.
 Waldeck-Rousseau government, the, 487.
 Walker, Bryant, 416; E., 279, 280; Le-Roy Pope, 41; Senator, of Wisconsin, 28.
 Walker, Williston, *The Reformation* (Review), 549.
 WALKER, WILLISTON, *Henry Barrow, Separatist, and the Exiled Church of Amsterdam*, by Fred J. Powicke (Review), 777.
 Wallace, D. D., *Constitutional History of South Carolina*, by W. ROY SMITH (Review), 175.
 Wallace, Hugh, 269.
 Wallachia, Austrian and Russian influence in, 257.
 Wallingford Castle, 667.
 Wallon amendment, the, 492.
 Walton, Jacob, 274.
 Walton, Joseph S., *Conrad Weiser and the Indian Policy of Colonial Pennsylvania* (Review), 816.
 Warburton, Sir Robert, *Eighteen Years in the Khyber, 1879-1898*, by ALFRED L. P. DENNIS (Review), 569.
 WARREN, F. M., *Paris as Seen and Described by Famous Writers*, edited by Esther Singleton (Review), 170.
 Washburn, M. C. from Illinois, 30.
 Washington, D. C., 47.
 Washington, President, first inaugural of, 213.
 Watson, Thomas E., *Thomas Jefferson*, by GEORGE H. HAYNES (Review), 842.
 Webb, James Watson, 453-456, 459, 461, 463.
 Webster, Daniel, 204-208, 213, 214, 287, 289, 291, 297-299; Noah, 448. |
Webster's Life and Correspondence, 286.
 Weed, Thurlow, 450-452.
 WEEDEN, WILLIAM B., *The Puritan Republic of the Massachusetts Bay in New England*, by Daniel W. Howe (Review), 138; *Stage-Coach and Tavern Days*, by Alice Morse Earle (Review), 580.
Weekly Astorian, the, 284.
 Weiser, Conrad, and the Indian Policy of Colonial Pennsylvania, by Joseph S. Walton (Review), 816.
 Weisshaupt, Professor, of Ingolstadt, 243.
 WELLS, CHARLES L., *Correspondance de Le Coz, Evêque Constitutionnel d'Ille-et-Vilaine*, par le P. Roussel (Review), 133; *Histoire des Rapports de l'Eglise et de l'Etat en France de 1789 à 1870*, par A. Debidour (Review), 362; *Lights and Shadows of a Long Episcopate*, by Henry B. Whipple (Review), 177.
 Welschinger, Henri, editor of *Mirabeau's Secret History of the Court of Berlin*, 235, 236, 241, 242, 248, 249, 253.
Welsh People, The, by John Rhys and David Brynmor Jones, by F. N. ROBINSON (Review), 349.
 WENDELL, BARRETT, *The Clergy in American Life and Letters*, by Daniel D. Addison (Review), 576; *A Life of Francis Parkman*, by Charles H. Farnham (Review), 376; *The Transit of Civilization from England to America in the Seventeenth Century*, by Edward Eggleston (Review), 802.
 Wendell, Barrett, *A Literary History of America*, by WALTER C. BRONSON (Review), 807.
Wesley and Methodism, by F. J. Snell, by WILLIAM EDWARDS HUNTINGTON (Review), 783.
 WEST, W. M., *English Common Law in the Early American Colonies*, by Paul S. Reinsch (Review), 584.
 Westchester County, 261.

- Westchester (Vreedland), 14, 704.
Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects, by W. Cunningham, by E. P. CHEYNEY (Review), 774.
 Western Reserve, the, 205, 207.
 West India Company, charter of the, 1621, 1; colonial government of the, 696, 705; colonies of, in Guiana, 53-55; policy of the, in New Netherland, 2-10, 12, 15, 16.
West Indies, French Experience with Representative Government in the, by PAUL S. REINSCH, 475.
 Westphalia, Peace of, claims to Guiana in the, 51.
 Westport, Mo., 43, 44, 46-48.
 Wharton, Capt. Walter, 719.
 Wheeler, Benjamin I., *Alexander the Great* (Review), 113.
 Wheeler, Thomas, 14.
 Whig Albany Regency, the, 450.
 Whig Club, the, 273.
 Whipple, Henry B., *Lights and Shadows of a Long Episcopate*, by CHARLES L. WELLS (Review), 177.
 White, Andrew D., 427; Elijah, 283, 289; Hon. Peter, 415, 423, 427.
 Whitfield, General, 47.
 Whitman College, 296.
Whitman, Marcus, The Legend of, by EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE, 276.
 Whitman, Perrin B., 281, 285.
 Whitmore, William H. (deceased), 183.
 Whorekill plantation, the, 720, 721.
 Wiapoco, the, 54.
 Wight, Capt. John, letter by, 519.
 Wilcox County, Ala., the Kansas question in, 41.
 Wilkes Exploring Expedition, 289.
 Willett, Thomas, 699.
 Williams, J. Rogers (editor), *Philip Vickers Fithian: Journal and Letters* (Review), 613.
 Wilson, H. W., *Adam Duncan* (Review), 388; *The Downfall of Spain: Naval History of the Spanish-American War*, by H. C. TAYLOR (Review), 159.
 Wiltwyck, 5, 7, 8.
 Wimpffen, la Baronne de (editor), *Lettres de Madame Reinhard à sa Mère*, by FERDINAND SCHWILL (Review), 787.
 Winchelsea (Sussex), rising in, 668.
 Windenberger, J. L., *Essai sur la Système de Politique Étrangère de J. J. Rousseau*, by C. E. Merriam (Review), 385.
 Winne, Peter, 267.
 Winship, George P., *Cabot Bibliography, with an Introductory Essay on the Careers of the Cabots*, by S. E. DAWSON (Review), 574.
 WINSHIP, GEORGE PARKER, *The Silver Map of the World; A Geographical Essay*, by Miller Christy (Review), 358.
 Wisconsin, history of, 198, 200, 202, 205, 207-211, 228, 229; public land policy of, 28, 29, 33.
Wisconsin, Collections of the State Historical Society of, Vol. XV. (Review), 613.
Wisconsin, The University of; its History and its Alumni, edited by Reuben G. Thwaites, by A. C. MCL. (Review), 392.
 Wise, Henry A., 233.
 Wister, Owen, *Ulysses S. Grant* (Review), 823.
With Both Armies in South Africa, by Richard H. Davis, by THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE (Review), 611.
Woman, The Legal Protection of, among the Ancient Germans, by William Rullkoetter, by GUY C. Lee (Review), 833.
 Woodburn, James A., 416.
 Worcester, Mass., 41.
World, the New York, 464.
Writings of James Monroe, The, Vol. III., edited by Stanislaus Murray Hamilton (Review), 368; Vol. IV. (Review), 596.
 Wylie, James H., *The Council of Constance to the Death of John Hus*, by GEORGE LINCOLN BURR (Review), 548.
 Yancey, William L., 41.
 Yates, Abraham, 267.
 Ybarguen y Vera, Domingo de, 52.
Year 1000, The, and the Antecedents of the Crusades, by GEORGE LINCOLN BURR, 429.
 York, 661.
 Yorkshire, 704, 713.
 Zachrey, John, 294, 295.
 Zani, Nicola, 647.
Zauberwahn, Inquisitionen und Hexenprozess im Mittelalter und die Entstehung der grossen Hexenverfolgung, von Joseph Hansen, by G. L. B. (Review), 609.
Zenger's Journal, 447.





E
171
A57
v.6

The American historical
review

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
